

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXIX.

APRIL, 1904.

THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, BART., M. P.

To requests which have been made to me to write on the political bearings of the war between Japan and Russia I have felt compelled to return refusal, on account of a fear of doing more harm than good in matters of such delicacy. Before, however, I comply with the request of the Editor to put on paper some very brief notes as to military and naval questions arising from the war, there are some considerations bearing upon the future relations between the United Kingdom and the United States which may possibly be treated with safety and advantage.

A very able writer in my country has asserted within the last few days that the present war will not terminate without an attempt at German intervention, calculated to lead to the creation of an alliance between Germany, Russia and France, to the detriment of the British Empire, and that it is a mistake on our part to think that, after Japanese successes, we can count upon a friendly feeling in the United States towards a policy capable of being represented as pro-Japanese.

It has, of course, been stated upon high French authority that the alliance of Germany, Russia and France, which was successful in expelling Japan from Manchuria after her Chinese war, has on two other occasions been suggested by Germany to France,

VOL. CLXXVIII.—NO. 569. 31

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

with a view to an anti-British policy, to be pursued even at the risk of war. It is asserted upon competent authority in Paris that, at the time of the Fashoda incident, and again in reference to Transvaal affairs, Germany proposed, and France declined to be a party to, this alliance. It is an alliance into which the present peaceful feeling of France, and the belief that the brunt of war would fall chiefly upon her, prevented France from entering; but it might be more tempting if it were accompanied by the offer of the retrocession of the lost provinces. No French Government, it is argued, could abstain from taking the steps which might be necessary to recover Alsace. On the other hand, the present German Emperor is deeply and personally committed to the absolute permanence of the incorporation of Alsace in the German Empire. But these speculations will carry us too far.

There is, of course, sufficient risk of an alliance against ourselves of the three Powers which hold the coast line of Northern Europe from the Atlantic to Asia, with the exception of the little bit of coast of the Low Countries, to make it a matter of which we think, if we do not talk of it. The "two-Powers standard" for our fleet has never corresponded to any real necessity. There has never been, at any time, the slightest chance of an alliance against us of France and Russia in which we should have only France and Russia to consider and should feel able to leave out of our account the rapidly increasing German fleet. The standard adopted of equality with two Powers in battle-ships, "plus a margin," with a more considerable superiority in cruisers, has always had this practical effect: that it made war with us, on the part of the three Powers suggested, impossible on account of the certainty, in the minds of the French authorities, that they would be left face to face with a fleet able to devote a large portion of its attention to themselves. Within the last year or two, and since the accession of his present Majesty, King Edward VII., the relations between Great Britain and France have vastly improved, all trace of anti-English feeling in the French populace has suddenly disappeared, and the change has been accompanied by an immense growth in France of really pacific feeling. So that, if one looks to general considerations, and detaches one's mind from the more narrow issues presented to us by the writer to whom I referred above, one is inclined to think that such danger as there was of a coalition against us is greatly lessened.

It is, however, the case that Germany might attempt to bring about the coalition, at a moment suitable to her preparations, automatically, and without any act of present volition on the part of France. If Germany were to declare war on Japan, Great Britain would be bound by her treaty engagements to declare war upon Russia and Germany; and France, it is understood, to declare war upon Great Britain and Japan. The result would, doubtless, be the diversion of Japanese efforts from Manchuria to the safer field for their ambition presented by the defenceless condition of Tonquin; and the war would have to be fought out in Europe between the British fleet on the one side and Germany and France upon the other. The light which has been shed upon the state of preparation for war of the Russian fleet seems to postpone any such danger for a time, but when people enter into conditional alliances they ought to remember the form which those alliances may assume at an unexpected moment. It is like going guarantee for a friend. One always has to pay the money at a time less convenient to oneself than the original day of signature.

The point from which I set out, and from which I have diverged, is that suggested by the writer who finds in the consequences of the war the probability of estrangement in our policy for the Pacific between Great Britain and the United States. He neglects, however, the main fact, which is, that the two Powers have the same interest in keeping China open to their trade, and that Japan probably does not desire, and certainly cannot afford, to pursue a different policy.

Turning to the safer subject of the war itself, it may be well to say a word as to Russian denunciation of the act of war which preceded any declaration. The steps taken by the Japanese Minister at St. Petersburg constituted as fair and complete a warning of war as is now usual before the first acts of war. America has produced some of the greatest text-books on international law, and they are there to confirm this statement. The greatest books on war are the German treatises, in all of which—and most recently by Von der Goltz—we are informed, upon the highest military authority, that acts of war will in future invariably precede the slower formal declaration. Von der Goltz goes much further than the Japanese in practice went, for he asserts that the moment that a Government has made up its own mind that war is neces-

sary to its policy, it must strike at once, without waiting for any other considerations. Every writer on naval warfare, and they are unfortunately many, who has discussed imaginary wars between ourselves and France has started with an attack exactly similar to that which the Japanese made upon Port Arthur, and at a date, as compared with the dates of negotiations, also exactly similar. That, after the action taken at St. Petersburg on the 5th of a month, the Japanese torpedo-boats should have been off Port Arthur on the night of the 7th, was "classic"; and it is an amazing fact that Russian want of preparation for war, always prophesied by competent political and military writers, should have been demonstrated in a fashion so absolutely astounding.

There remains for consideration the nature of the Japanese forces, and the bearing of their character upon the progress of land war, supposing that we are right in thinking that the Russian fleets are cooped up, partially destroyed and wholly paralyzed.

The foreign observers who saw the Japanese during the allied operations known as the relief of Peking, have all told us the same story. Some, perhaps the English only, were frankly pro-Japanese; but even those who were the most anti-Japanese, such as the best German officers employed in the joint operations, have, to the credit of their scientific impartiality, recounted exactly the same facts in exactly the same fashion. At the attack on the walled city of Tientsin the Japanese had, perhaps, the most difficult portion of the task, the direct advance in the centre falling to their share. Under a murderous fire they went forward without a check. All others hesitated; and, after hesitation, the English and American blue-jackets went forward also. No one else on that occasion seems to have done well. On the other Tientsin day, when the Russians were holding the railway station, and the river lay between them and the ammunition and reinforcements for which they had asked, detachments of troops of various Powers tried to get across the bridge to their assistance. The Chinese artillery had got the range and were playing steadily on the bridge with shrapnel. When others had completely failed, a Japanese party came along with two mule wagons full of ammunition. The mules were mostly killed or wounded as soon as they got on to the bridge; the Japanese soldiers harnessed themselves to the carts with ropes and safely conveyed them over. Those of us who know much of the best of our Goorkha battalions in India—those short,

bandy-legged Mongolians from Nepal—who are the best mercenary troops that the world has known, fighting for fighting's sake, but full of discipline—class the Japanese private with the Goorkha, in the fact that alone he has never run away. The Americans are remarkable for courage, but perhaps even Americans have, on rare occasions, been known to run. We, most certainly, have been, on many. The Sikhs are sometimes quoted as superior to the best European troops; but though they are often excellent, they do not deserve this place. The Goorkhas, however, hold it without contestation among all who know them, and are now matched in a class by themselves with the Japanese. The drawback to the Goorkhas is that they are mercenaries, commanded by officers of a different stature and color, as well as of an alien race. The Japanese are officered by themselves, and officers and men are animated, not by mere love of fighting, but by a common patriotism. The Russians and the Japanese, engaged against one another in the present war, are indeed beyond all doubt the two most truly patriotic nations of the Old World.

With such material, what are the Japanese likely now to do? On paper, there can be no doubt as to what strategy would be suggested to them by any Intelligence Department of any War Office in the world. A good many years ago I ventured to contend, against the opinion then held by our War Office, that the only place where Russia was vulnerable to our arms was on the Pacific coast—at Vladivostock as matters then stood. There alone she could be bled, as, in the days before her southern railroads, we bled her in the Crimea. When I came, in conjunction with Mr. Spenser Wilkinson, to help to prepare our joint volume upon "Imperial Defence," there was some little difference between us on this subject, which we afterwards admitted in a later edition of that book. As often occurs between those who work together, each of us converted the other, although perhaps the conversion did not continue. The argument against me was that, although we could be successful on the Pacific coast, yet the blow would not be sufficient to induce Russia either to give up the fight or to relax her efforts in other portions of the world. She would know that a peace would ultimately be reached in which, unless she were everywhere unsuccessful, she might hope to regain the provinces and the influence which she had temporarily lost. Her railway to Port Arthur has made her not less but more vulnerable to Powers

possessing the command of the sea, and the alarm which led a panic-stricken Cabinet to seize the useless position of Wei-hai-wei has given way to a sound understanding that the Russian railway to Port Arthur is much exposed to attack throughout the greater portion of its southern course. The Japanese would, then, naturally expect to be able to cut the railway somewhere near Port Arthur, and to intrench themselves upon it in a position both naturally strong and easily reachable from the sea. A second Torres Vedras would naturally be found in the northern portion of Korea, where the defending army would also be on the flank of any attacking army which might try to relieve Port Arthur. On the other hand, the capture of Port Arthur would be a terrible blow to the prestige of Russia throughout the East.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

SOME REVELATIONS OF THE WAR.

BY ANGLO-AMERICAN.

WAR is always revealing. In itself the highest manifestation of a nation's spiritual and physical unity, clarifying the mind, exalting the heart and precipitating into visible coherence and substance the ideals and policies and aspirations of the Powers actually engaged in it, its influence over those who merely stand on its fringe and pretend to no more than a subsidiary interest in its fortunes, is hardly less masterful and condensing. Beneath its awful shock the cobwebs of tradition, vagueness and indecision are scattered, realities are unveiled and fundamentals made manifest. A hundred conflicts might be quoted that have emitted this illuminating flash, but it will suffice to mention two. The Spanish-American war revealed Europe to the United States, the United States to Europe, and the destiny of America to the Americans themselves. The Boer war revealed the British Empire to Great Britain, and laid bare at a stroke and in all its momentous fulness a profound political antagonism between British and German aspirations. Not less evident, and perhaps of even weightier significance, are the discoveries which have burst from the flames of this Far Eastern conflict. Affecting the United States primarily, their reflex action and the issue that cannot but flow from them must ultimately, I conceive, connect with the whole world of international politics. Briefly, those discoveries amount to this. In the first place, there is an end of the "traditional" friendship between the United States and Russia. In the second place, Americans realize, as they have never realized before, how vast is their stake in the future of China, and how impossible it is for the United States to hold aloof from the strife of policies and interests that centres in the Far East.

One of the first things that an inquirer notices about the United

States is the contrast, so great as to be quite extraordinary, between the intelligence of the people and their susceptibility to "crazes." The sum total of American intelligence is undoubtedly immense. I am speaking, of course, rather of quantity than quality; in sheer bulk the mass of American "mentality" far outweighs that of any other country. Nowhere else have so many people been raised to the level of what is known as "middle-class opinion"; the average which few rise above or fall below is of a high standard and remarkably sustained. And yet, in spite of this, it is safe to say that no nation gets so constantly swept away by movements opposed to all human experience or contradicted by ordinary facts of economics. There is no country in Europe where such a fundamental fallacy as Bryanism, for instance, could have made the headway it made in the United States. Several reasons might be given to account for this. The most important of them are to be found in the changes that have come over American politics since the Civil War; more specifically in the great and growing power of the "machine," and the sway of the Boss, and the consequent decline in leadership of the Clay and Webster type. Argument and instruction, as weapons of political persuasion, always tend to fall into disuse in a country where "machines" accumulate and men decay. Electioneering and the mere mechanism of politics, party tactics and the ballot-box point of view, acquire in such a country an ascendancy positively injurious to the political education of the people. This will perhaps be made clearer if we compare the English and American systems. In England, almost since the time of Burke, it has been the custom to require of an M. P. at least one address to his constituents a year. These meetings are the saving clause of the English democracy. They are held at a time when electioneering is in abeyance, and nothing worse than a merely human partisanship is expected of the speaker. An M. P. who has no immediate need to worry about his seat may condescend to an impartiality which a candidate can hardly afford. He has no personal points to score, no opponent more formidable than a stray heckler to meet, and no stress is put upon him to enforce more than the reasonable party view. And even that he need not press too eagerly, for the average Englishman dislikes political zealots. The speeches made on such occasions are as a rule far more temperate and informing than those which the same speaker delivers during

a campaign or from the floor of the House. Again, these meetings help to concentrate attention on the work of administration and the broader aspects of policy. This is to perform a most important service, for democracies everywhere are too apt to think that they have solved the problems of government when they elect one set of candidates to office in preference to another set. Too much thought is given to who is to do the work and too little to how it is being done. The constant appearance of members of Parliament on public platforms serves to put elections in their proper place. They keep the public informed on the rights and wrongs of public questions, not spasmodically or for the purposes of a single election, but regularly and continuously. I doubt whether democracy has ever justified itself more emphatically than in England during the past months of the fiscal discussion.

Before the Civil War and before the organization of politics reached its present comprehensiveness, this used also to be a characteristic of American public life. That it is so no longer will scarcely, I think, be disputed, in spite of Mr. Roosevelt's attempts to make the Presidential office a sort of provisional Judgment Seat on all things human and divine. Bossism and the dominion of the caucus are incompatible with the light and leading of the older school of statesmen. Moreover, the American theory that one's next-door neighbor is only a little less qualified than oneself to run the United States does not tend to make Congress an intellectually inspiring body. The habit of regarding representatives in the light of pledged delegates, bound to carry out the mandates of their constituents, and of leaving as little as may be to their discretion and individual judgment, likewise helps to dam the flow of instruction from its natural fountain-head. Again, compared with the devouring interest that is concentrated on the House of Commons, the people of the United States are indifferent to Congress. Congressional debates are not usually reported in the daily papers at any serviceable length, and consequently have practically little influence on public opinion. The very idea of looking to Congress for real guidance in public affairs is disappearing, if it has not already disappeared. Very few Congressmen or Senators dream of visiting their constituents, except at election time, for the purpose of addressing a meeting on political topics. The result is, that the national legislature, as a factor in the political education of the country, may be almost

ruled out. There remain the Press and the annual "Messages" of the President and State Governors. The latter, thanks to their unconscionable length, are for the most part "taken as read" by the average citizen. That, at any rate, is not the fate of the Press, but the political influence of the American Press is a most uncertain quantity—so much so that at times one doubts whether the Press has any such influence at all. And, after all, the most impressive, and in the long run the most adequate, way of educating the democracy is not by writing but by speaking. Instruction by word of mouth is always more lasting and effectual than instruction doled out in print. That is why "correspondence colleges" are such poor things. A nation, indeed, that rarely resorts to the platform except at moments of supreme excitement when reason is at a discount, dooms itself to political incompleteness, if not to political ignorance. Except when his vote is wanted, the average American is too rarely appealed to for an opinion, and any conclusions he may come to on matters of national policy have, therefore, the disadvantage of not being submitted to the touchstone of a riper and more experienced judgment. While, therefore, one may say that the operative force of English politics is middle-class opinion revised and corrected by the best or nearly the best intelligence of the country, that of American politics is middle-class opinion left pretty much to its own devices.

This is a shortcoming which the intellectual uniformity of America is liable to aggravate into a defect. An idea once implanted in the average man sweeps over the entire continent with a speed and completeness that no other nation can even begin to parallel. It is, therefore, doubly desirable that the idea should be a sound one and not the mere outcome of caprice, unreasoning emotion or half-baked knowledge. And what is desirable in the domestic politics of the United States becomes almost imperative in its foreign affairs—first, because their immense complexity makes a firm grip of fundamentals essential to the prosecution of a stable policy; secondly, because the average American, having hitherto treated them as a mere parergon, to be studied cursorily, if at all, is more than usually liable to form judgments that have little relation to the facts; and thirdly, because public opinion in the United States determines, with a minuteness unknown elsewhere, the lines on which the foreign policy of the nation is to run. I know of no greater American need at this mo-

ment than a course of systematic instruction in the elements of international politics, and the need is all the more insistent because of the peculiar difficulties in the way of meeting it. There is no country in which a political prejudice lives longer than in the United States. Americans have good memories; they live intensely in the stirring events of their brief and brilliant past; and the impressions left by those events crystallize into traditions with a facility absolutely unique. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, before the conflict with Spain, the idea of revising in the light of present-day realities the "traditions" bequeathed by the Revolution and the Civil War, would have been regarded by most Americans as almost sacrilegious. The international results of the Spanish War created from Maine to California a surprise so ingenuous as to be positively laughable. Then for the first time did it dawn on Americans that it might not be the height of wisdom always to judge the present by the past, to assume that the England of the "Alabama" days must necessarily be the England of 1898. In a flash, England fell from her time-honored position as the appointed foe of the United States; and, in a flash, her place was forced upon Germany. Germany was now installed as "the enemy." The next war, it was settled, would be with Germany. Much of the Teutophobia was exaggerated; a good deal of it was irrational and could draw no warrant for its vehemence from a calm survey of either German or American policy. Nevertheless, it was a sign of advance and a symptom of enlightenment. If it showed that the unhingement of the public mind produced by the revelations of the Spanish War had not yet adjusted itself, it also showed that the view of England as the sole and predestined "enemy" had at last been outgrown.

But there remained one stronghold of "tradition" still to be captured. The Spanish War had indeed battered a breach into it. Inspired Russian journals had discussed a European coalition against "the presumptuous Yankees," had pointed with bewildering tactlessness to the unfortified state of the Pacific coast, had received the American acquisition of the Philippines with a growl of intense and prophetic displeasure; and these things Americans had made a note of. But, in effect, the towering citadel of "Russo-American friendship" still flew its old deceptive flag. It needed the tangible experience of actual participation in *Welt-politik*, a year or two of focussed attention on the realities of Rus-

sian policy in the Far East and at home and on the unchanging characteristics of Russian diplomacy, before Americans could clear their minds of all illusions. And now enlightenment has come. Rising, year by year, in progressive volume, it has now poured like a flood over the national consciousness, sweeping away the phantoms and hallucinations of the past. The belief that Russia and the United States were natural affinities had its central root, so far as I could ever discover, in the legend that Russia was prepared to resist any intervention by France or England on behalf of the Confederate States. The legend itself sprang from the fact that in 1863 half a dozen wooden vessels belonging to the Russian fleet did actually drop anchor in New York Harbor. Not a single line can be found in the Washington archives to connect the arrival of those vessels with the crisis through which America was passing. It is an assumption absolutely unsubstantiated by any evidence in the possession of the administration. So far as I know, the only reference, if reference it be, to any understanding between the Russian and American Governments at that time is to be found in a private letter written by Mr. Seward—a mere hint, abundantly qualified, of vague possibilities that might happen “sooner or later.” But the matter may easily be brought to a decisive test. We have been assured that the commander of the Russian squadron had “sealed orders.” A copy of those orders must surely exist. Let the Russian Government produce them—if it dares. It will not dare because from first to last the whole tale is a pure fabrication.

And yet for a whole generation the legend has held sway, gaining new power and confidence by the mere magic of repetition. For a whole generation Americans have felt themselves under an obligation to Russia, predisposed to receive Russian proposals with sympathy, and sentimentally interested in the movements of Russian policy. The positive results of this partiality have been inconsiderable because until now Russian and American interests have lain too far apart for the operation of practical friendship or practical antagonism; but its indirect results have been greater than most Americans can realize even now. The adroitness of successive Russian Ambassadors at Washington in keeping England and America apart, in perpetuating and fomenting the unnatural divisions that used to separate the two Powers that have more in common than any other two Powers on this

earth, in fostering the bitterness of the Irish-American element, and in constantly emphasizing through the Press the peculiar bonds of gratitude that linked the United States to Russia, has from the Russian point of view been admirable. There has not for years been a single question at issue between England and America, the settlement of which Russian diplomacy has not tried to thwart. If any one doubts that the supreme object of Russian diplomacy in Washington has been the maintenance of Anglo-American suspiciousness and distrust, let him turn to the article contributed to this REVIEW about five years ago by Vladimir Holmstrem and Prince Oukhtomsky (*"Ex Oriente Lux,"* July, 1899). In it he will find an almost embarrassingly frank avowal of Russia's determination to rescue the United States from "British tutelage," and an appeal to Heaven to "preserve America from the curse of Western Imperialism into which England is now tempting her." That has always been the Russian goal. To keep America at odds with England and away from the Far East is the end to which a long line of Ministers and Ambassadors have devoted their shrewdest and most pertinacious efforts; and in prosecuting it their strongest weapon has been the "traditional friendship" uniting Russia and the United States. But that, while the supreme, was by no means the sole, object of Russian policy. Sentiment counts even in Wall Street, and Russia has for years been hoping to offset the exhaustion of France and the reluctance of London and Berlin by tapping the financial markets of America. Here again the "tradition" has been brought into play and worked to its fullest capacity.

So that the marvellous legend has had its visible, still more its invisible, uses. And yet to a detached onlooker there was always a false and hollow ring about the "friendliness" to which it gave birth, always something against the grain of nature in the "sympathy" so loudly trumpeted. Apart from politics, what real affinity could there be between the nation that had raised Western civilization to its highest level and the nation that regards Western civilization as the tottering forerunner of anarchy; between a free republic and a church-supported autocracy; between a people to whom religious liberty, personal liberty, political liberty is as the breath of life and a people dominated by the obscurantism of a mediæval orthodoxy, by the passport system, the censorship and bureaucratic espionage; between a race nourished on individualism

and a race that owes whatever strength it possesses to the intensity of its communistic instincts; between education and illiteracy, progress and the obstinate lethargy of feudalism, Anglo-Saxon honesty and Oriental evasiveness, freedom and a despotism only mitigated, if at all, by venality? Merely to think of Russia and the United States together is to be confronted, as de Tocqueville long ago divined, with an array of immutable contradictions. It could therefore be only a question of time before the shock of some great event would shatter the notion of "sympathy" between such irreconcilable opposites.

The process of American disillusionment began, indeed, with a clash of political interests. The widening scope of America's activity and the swift development of the Far Eastern drama revealed for the first time an antagonism in material aims between Russia and the United States. But, once begun, nothing could prevent that process from spreading beyond the sphere of politics. A general recanvassing of Russo-American relations as a whole, spiritual and ethical as well as political, was bound to follow; and its issue was not hard to foresee. Freed from the bondage of "tradition," no longer willing to accept declarations as facts or smooth professions as realities, Americans awoke with reluctant amazement to a perception of things as they were. Several incidents happened along to hasten the work of emancipation—a small but irritating war of tariffs, the Russian swoop upon Manchuria with its flagrant menace to American trade, Blagovestchenck and the brutality of the Russian troops after the occupation of Pekin, Kishineff and the whole question of Russia's treatment of the Jews, and lastly the illuminating tissue of broken pledges, equivocation and shifty deceit woven into recent negotiations and reproduced in the dealings with Mr. Hay. Of all this we see in the present war the culmination and predestined issue, amazing and all but incredible to Russia and not less wonderful to any American who will allow his thoughts to travel back a brief decade. It is not merely that Americans feel the fascination of Japan, applaud her vehement gallantry, and find their Far Eastern policy substantially at one with hers. This, while it would account for the sympathies of the American people being strongly pro-Japanese, would not explain why they are even more strongly anti-Russian. For that we must look deeper, and it will, I think, be found in this fact, that, over and above a political antagonism

deeply rooted in national interests, Americans have developed towards Russia a feeling of moral repulsion.

I question whether Americans are yet fully aware how much solid ground they have for this sentiment. With the bulk of them it is at least as much an instinct as a reasoned conclusion, and perhaps only a few realize how amply it might be substantiated if a verbatim report of the Russian negotiations with the State Department could be given to the world and if the triumphs of Mr. Hay's patient, pertinent and relentless diplomacy over the subtrefuges, casuistry and blandishments of the Russian diplomacy could be set forth in detail. No diplomacy could have shown a higher union of practicality and imagination, or a politer or more deadly insistence on the essentials, than Mr. Hay's; and what he has had to face not only in the way of ultra-Oriental evasions but of offers—such, for instance, as the offer of preferential treatment for American trade in Manchuria—that practically amounted to colossal national bribes, will perhaps never be adequately known. There is a good deal that might be written, and some day, I hope, will be written, on this head; but it would be beyond the scope of this article to enter upon it now. My present purpose is rather to enforce what I take to be the vital lesson that Americans should learn from the record of their relations with Russia—thirty years of enslavement to a myth, a legend, a fantastic invention, taken on trust with uninquiring confidence; thirty years of docile mobility as a pawn in Russia's game against England; thirty years of obstinate blindness to the plainest facts of international politics; thirty years of effusive "sympathy" with the Power of all Powers whose system most flatly denies the ideals that America has made her own. Is this, may I ask, a record with which Americans, as they glance over it, can feel in any way satisfied? A grave responsibility there is no shuffling out of rests upon every politician and every journalist who has helped to perpetuate this amazing "tradition," and thereby contributed his quota to the further engulfment of his country in a morass of unrealities. I know perfectly well what reply it is that Americans make to such criticism. They argue that the truth about Russia's supposed action in the Civil War has always been known and understood at Washington; that the "tradition" has never deluded any one of importance, that it made for harmony between the two countries, and that, in the days of America's isolation, it was not

worth while exposing it. But against this I would urge that, as the foreign policy of the United States must be responsive to public opinion, it is of the first importance that that opinion should be instructed in the facts; that a nation cannot feed on fairy tales without harm to its powers of seeing and thinking clearly; and that as a matter of fact the Russian "tradition" has more than once decisively influenced the relations between the United States and other Powers. Besides this, there is a real peril in the revulsion that follows the moment of awakening. It is clear, for instance, that American opinion to-day is running to extremes. The same sort of reaction was visible after the Spanish War in the violent outburst of Teutophobia that swept across the country. Such outbursts are of course destructive of the quiet and comprehensive reflection that can alone enable a nation—as it has enabled the Japanese—to adopt and pursue a settled line of policy. Yet I do not see how they can be prevented unless the influences that do most towards the moulding of opinion—particularly the Press and the leading politicians of the country—recognize the necessity of discussing America's foreign policy more frequently, more temperately, and, above all, as a cohesive whole. For five years during which I lived in the United States I never heard of an American politician, except Senator Beveridge, devoting more than a passing reference to the Far-Eastern question in an address to his constituents. That, obviously, is not as it should be; and there is no moral to be drawn from the record of Russo-American relations more apparent than the need of accustoming the people to examine and debate the foundations of their foreign policy. I hope the time may come when the Secretary of State, the leading members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, the editors of the great papers and those shrewd and far-seeing business men who have grasped the importance of China to the commercial future of the United States, will more or less unite in giving the country a lead in this vital matter through the agency of public meetings and addresses and the Press. Only so can the nation pursue in the Far East the same unwavering policy it has pursued in South America. Only so can those violent fluctuations of opinion which are the mark of distracted counsels and shifting aims be avoided. Only so can preposterous "traditions" be challenged and exposed and bed-rock realities unveiled.

There is one fundamental point in the Far-Eastern question,

as it affects the United States, which Americans have yet to settle within themselves. The United States stands definitely committed (in Captain Mahan's words) (1) to the open door, and (2) to "the prevention of preponderant political control by any one external state or group of states." American policy, that is, insists upon an equality of commercial privileges and respect for the territorial and administrative integrity of China. I may, perhaps, be permitted to recall the deductions which Captain Mahan drew from the enunciation of this policy. That foremost of living commentators on international politics warned his countrymen that their policy differed from that of other states, that the prosecution of it demanded the application of sea-power, that the valley of the Yangtse was "the central scene of our general interest," and that to exert her proper influence along that penetrating highway the United States must be prepared not only to employ force, if necessary, but to get rid of that "caricature of independence," that supremely elementary fallacy, which rules out the possibility of voluntary cooperation, from time to time, with other Powers, on the ground that it is opposed to, instead of being, as it is, a condition of, her complete freedom of choice and action. "Briefly," said Captain Mahan, and these words strike down to the root of things, "we cannot be sure of the commercial advantages known as the 'open door,' unless we are prepared to do our share in holding it open. We cannot count upon respect for the territory of China unless we are ready to throw, not only our moral influence, but, if necessity arise, our physical weight, into the conflict, to resist an expropriation, the result of which might be to exclude our commerce and neutralize our influence." But it will be said that Mr. Hay has already secured these objects without moving a single ship or a single soldier. Mr. Hay's diplomacy, I heartily admit, has been singularly adroit, pertinacious and so far successful. It has conciliated China, baffled Russia, and amply established the American position. But nothing can be more certain than that diplomacy, to be permanently effective, must rest and can only rest on the implication of force. For a while, despatch-writing and the pressure of "moral influence" may apparently be all that is needed; but the time will assuredly come when the pregnant common sense of the Kaiser's dictum will have to be admitted: "If anything has to be done in this world, the pen will be powerless to carry it through

unless backed by the force of the sword." Now, I do not think that Americans have yet realized this axiom as a hard and constant fact. I do not think that war in defence of American rights in the Far East has yet presented itself as a serious possibility to the national consciousness. "Fortunately for the United States," wrote Mr. Josiah Quincy during the Boxer *émeute* of 1900, "in spite of our large army in the Philippines and our troops now in China, no sane American thinks that we will fight with any other member of the Concert, whatever may be our policy or our interests, either to prevent the dismemberment of China or to secure any share in the partition for ourselves, or to reform the Chinese Government, or even to maintain the open door for our trade." That is a definite and categorical statement. Does it or does it not reflect the sentiments of the United States to-day? Is it true that the open door and the territorial integrity of China represent the wishes, but not the determination, of America; that opinion will support Mr. Hay only so long as he spills ink but no blood? Is American policy in China nothing more than the policy of the French at Fashoda—a policy of bluff, to be abandoned when seriously challenged? Until these questions are answered, until it is known whether America regards her stake in the commercial future of China as sufficiently important to justify, if need be, a war in its defence, it is impossible to say whether such a thing as an American Far-Eastern policy really exists, or, if it exists, whether it is based on rock or on sand. No pen has flowed faster than Mr. Hay's since he first launched his Circular to the Powers in September, 1899; but the Chinese question, I must again insist, is not one of those cases in which the pen is mightier than the sword. Had Mr. Hay all the qualities of a Bismarck—and I believe he has most of them—he would still, in the last resort, be fundamentally helpless without a Moltke in the background. This, then, is pre-eminently the question which Americans have to face, and I would most earnestly press upon them the urgency of revolving it not in the light of what Washington may have said in the eighteenth century, not in the light of any such "tradition" as for a whole generation hypnotized the relations between Russia and the United States, but simply with reference to present-day conditions and the probabilities of the immediate future.

ANGLO-AMERICAN.

STATE MONOPOLIES OF INTER-STATE COMMERCE.

BY E. PARMALEE PRENTICE.

THE commerce clause of the Federal Constitution presents the remarkable instance of a national power which was comparatively unimportant for ninety years, and which, in the last twenty-five years, has so developed that it is now in its nationalizing tendency the most important and conspicuous power possessed by the Federal Government. The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case marks the latest, and perhaps the longest, step yet taken in this rapid progress.

The Constitution gives to Congress power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." Federal authority on this subject is compassed in these words. There is naught else save what may be found by implication.

Congress has also jurisdiction over a number of subjects of a kindred nature, such as the power to coin money; to establish uniform laws of bankruptcy; to establish post-offices and post-roads; to regulate weights and measures; to grant patents and copyrights. All these powers, in the early days of the Government, the States shared, in a greater or less degree, with the United States. In Maryland, for example, the Federal currency was established by the Act of December 21st, 1812, "recognizing the coin of the United States." In Massachusetts, this was done by the Act of February 25th, 1795, "introducing the dollar and its parts"; and other statutes of this sort may be found.¹ Patents were granted by a number of States.² That the copyright

¹ New York, Act of January 27th, 1797; North Carolina, Act of 1809, Ch. 17.

² New York, Act of Feb. 26th, 1789; Vermont, Act of Oct. 19th, 1801; Massachusetts, Act of June 15th, 1793; Maryland, Act of Jan. 22d, 1785.

granted by New Hampshire in the Act of November 7th, 1783, was considered in force after the adoption of the Constitution, is indicated by the fact that the statute is included in the "Laws of 1815,"¹ a book "published by authority" and containing "all the general and public statutes now in force."

It may well be assumed, therefore, that, at the outset, it was not generally considered that possession by the United States of the power to regulate commerce restricted in any way the authority of the States. The nature of the power which had been granted to Congress was very little understood. "Commerce among the States" had hardly come into existence. At the commencement of the Revolution there was but one connected road from North to South, and that a very imperfect one.² The only roads which were maintained were those which led from the interior of each State to the principal towns on its navigable waters. Even in 1796, these were the only roads with which the States were much concerned; the care of the "cross-roads," as they were called by one who had been a member of the Constitutional Convention, the States were unwilling to undertake.³ Foreign trade was the chief commercial interest of the country; but all trade on a large scale, whether foreign or inter-State, was conducted by water, and for this reason the Federal power over commerce was naturally defined in terms of water transportation. Said President Monroe:

"Commerce between independent powers or communities is universally regulated by duties and imposts. It was so regulated by the States before the adoption of this Constitution equally in respect to each other and to foreign powers. The goods and vessels employed in the trade are the only subjects of regulation. It can act on none other. A power, then, to impose such duties and imposts in regard to foreign nations, and to prevent any on the trade between the States, was the only power granted."

In "The Railroads and the Commerce Clause" (p. 19), Mr. Hartshorne says:

"The phrase 'regulate commerce' was a familiar one at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, having been used in no less than twenty-seven Acts of Parliament passed before that time. Those laws

¹ Laws of New Hampshire, 1815, p. 365.

² President Monroe's Message of May 4, 1822.

³ Speech of Abraham Baldwin, February 11th, 1796, Annals of 4th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 314.

⁴ Monroe's Message of May 4th, 1822.

consisted mostly of port and harbor regulations, navigation laws, etc., and had relation more to the vessels and other instruments employed in commerce, than to the commerce itself."

This statement is, perhaps, too strong, for the Act of 23 Geo. II., ch. 29, sec. 9, though it did not use the phrase, nevertheless exercised the power by forbidding the manufacture in America of the products of iron. As employed by the States, however, before the adoption of the Constitution, the meaning which Mr. Hartshorne attributes to the phrase is substantially accurate.¹ Edmund Randolph, the first Attorney-General under the Constitution, in the opinion which he rendered to President Washington on the 12th of February, 1791, said:

"The power to regulate commerce amounts to little more than the power to establish the forms of commercial intercourse between the States, and to keep the prohibitions which the Constitution imposes on that intercourse undiminished in their operation; that is, to prevent taxes on imports or exports; preference to one port over another, by any regulation of commerce or revenue; and duties upon the entering or clearing of the vessels of one State in the ports of another."

As thus defined, there was nothing in the Federal power over commerce which would prevent grants by a State of exclusive privileges of inter-State transportation.

On the other hand, it seemed necessary that such monopolies should be established. Inter-State communication was required both for political and for commercial reasons; but the States could not themselves build the roads and run the coaches, and the profit to be derived from the business was not sufficient to induce individuals to incur the risks of competition. The result was, that many grants of exclusive privileges were given by the several States.

An interesting illustration of such legislation is found in the Act of Vermont of October 31st, 1792, "granting to Levi Pease the exclusive privilege of running a stage on the route from Springfield on the post-road to Dartmouth College through this State for the term of twelve years." This statute, which contrasts strangely with present theories of the law, reads as follows:

"Whereas Levi Pease, of Boston, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has, at great expense and trouble, established a stage from Springfield, in the

¹ See Act of New Hampshire, November 26th, 1778; Law of North Carolina of 1785, Ch. 3; See Laws of 1715-1795, Ch. 234.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, up Connecticut River as far as Dartmouth College; which stage runs a large distance, in the State of Vermont. And whereas the said Levi represents that the emoluments of the stage, though at present small, may in a few years by proper encouragement, become lucrative to himself, and advantageous to the inhabitants upon Connecticut River and the adjacent country. Therefore, for the due encouragement of so beneficial an undertaking,

"It is hereby enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, that the said Levi Pease have, and there is hereby given to him, the sole and exclusive right and privilege of running the stage on the aforesaid route through this State, for and during the term of twelve years, on the following conditions, to wit: that the said Levi Pease shall not exact more or greater fare than is usually received on the different routes of the mail stage through Connecticut and Massachusetts. And

"It is further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if the mail of the United States should be hereafter continued up the River Connecticut, to Newbury, the said Levi shall have the same privilege of extending his line of stage to Newbury aforesaid upon the same conditions as are heretofore mentioned in this Act.

"Provided always, that if the said Levi shall neglect to run the stage, as aforesaid, for the space of two months, at any time within the said term of twelve years, then, and in that case he shall be deprived of all benefit of this Act, anything herein expressed to the contrary notwithstanding."

On November 4th, 1799, the State of Vermont granted to an individual an exclusive right of ferriage from Rowley's Point, Vermont, to Sandy Battery, New York; the rates of ferriage to be fixed by the Selectmen of Shoreham, and the monopoly to last ten years. On October 26th, 1801, Vermont granted to individuals an exclusive right of ferriage from Windmill Point, Vermont, to the opposite shore in New York; the rates of ferriage to be fixed by the Selectmen of Alburgh, and the monopoly to last ten years. On October 27th, 1801, Vermont granted an exclusive right of ferriage to Putnam's Point, New York, the rates to be fixed by the Selectmen of Bridport, and the monopoly to last ten years. In 1795, the State of New Hampshire granted to an individual the exclusive right to maintain a toll-bridge across the Connecticut at Bellows Falls, forbidding the erection of any other bridge for a mile above or a mile below. The bridge so authorized was erected, and the monopoly created over a hundred years ago still exists.

On March 30th, 1797, the State of New York granted to an individual the exclusive right to run stages, etc., between Goshen,

Orange County, and New York City. The natural course of this coach would be through the Ramapo Valley, past Tuxedo, and through a portion of New Jersey. The statute does not specify the route to be followed, but it excludes all competition between the two points named, and therefore covers all routes. On March 30, 1798, the State of New York granted to an individual the exclusive right of transportation between Lansingburg, near Troy, to Hampton, Washington County. The latter point is very near the Vermont State line, west of Rutland. Another statute of the same sort is found in the Act of New York of February 26, 1803, giving for seven years an exclusive right of transportation between Albany and a point to be selected by the grantee on the north boundary line of New Jersey. A similar statute, granting a monopoly to a point on a State line, was passed by Maryland on December 21, 1790, and another by Virginia, Act of December 21st, 1790. Many statutes of the same general character may be found.

The question of the constitutionality of such laws was brought before Congress in 1792, upon a motion to allow the proprietors of stages employed in carrying the mails to carry passengers also. This, it was answered, was not within the power of Congress. Said Mr. Niles:

"The question is simply whether Congress have a right to authorize the carrier of the mail to carry passengers on hire, through those States, where an exclusive right of carrying passengers has been granted by the State government and still exists. You are empowered by the Constitution to establish post-offices and post-roads, and to do whatever may be necessary and proper to carry that power into effect. Now, sir, is it necessary in order to the transportation of your mail that you should erect stage-coaches for the purpose of transporting passengers? What has your mail to do with passengers transported for hire? Why, sir, nothing more than this,—by granting to the carrier of your mail a right to carry passengers for hire, the carriage of the mail may be a little less expensive. Does this consideration render it necessary and proper for you to violate the laws of the States?"¹

The motion was lost. No suggestion was made that the State laws in any way concerned the Federal power over commerce, or that their validity was open to question on this ground.

In 1824 the case of *Gibbons vs. Ogden*² brought the whole subject before the Supreme Court. This great case

¹ Annals 2d Congress (1792), pp. 303-309.

² 9 Wheat., 1.

involved the validity of a law of the State of New York giving to Livingston and Fulton, and their assigns, the exclusive right to navigate the waters of that State by steam-boats. On the part of the appellant it was contended, that such a law was an attempt by the State to regulate commerce, that this power of regulation had been given to Congress, and that the State had no jurisdiction over the subject. For the respondent it was urged, that the Federal power over commerce, in the absence of Federal legislation, did not exclude State action, and, furthermore, that, if a law passed by a State in the exercise of its acknowledged sovereignty come into conflict with a law passed by Congress in pursuance of the Constitution, they affect the subject and each other like equal opposing powers.

Thus, eight years before the ordinance of South Carolina, the doctrine of Nullification was presented to the Supreme Court.¹

In the opinion of the court the supremacy of Federal authority and the exclusive character of the national power of regulation, were clearly defined.

In reading that momentous decision, apprehending as we do now the interests which were at stake, and with which the conclusion was pregnant, one cannot help pausing to wonder what might have been the result had that decision in any way been different from what it was. Had the utterance of the Court upon the powers of the States been ambiguous; had expression upon the relation of the States to the Federal government been avoided, and the element of nationality, which was involved, less explicitly been disclosed and asserted; had it been allowed to cripple the commercial power of the nation in any way,—where would the influence of that decision have led us now? We may find some suggestion of an answer to this question in the dissensions of the court in New York *vs. Miln*, in the Passenger Cases, the License Cases, and in the statement of Mr. Justice Barbour, that the police power of the State is “complete, unqualified and exclusive.”

In the years to come, said Mr. Wayne MacVeagh, it will probably be recognized that among Chief-Justice Marshall’s decisions “none will surpass in permanent material advantage that

¹The same subject had been before the United States Circuit Court in South Carolina a year earlier, and the decision rendered by Mr. Justice Johnson had supported the national authority. *Elkisson vs. Deliesseline*, 2 Wheel., Cr. Cas., 56.

decision which determined that the power to regulate commerce resided exclusively in Congress, and must be kept inviolate from any intrusion by the States, under any guise whatever."¹ Senator Sumner expressed similar views. "If there be any single fruit of our national unity," he said, "if there be any single element of the Union, if there be any single triumph of the Constitution which may be placed above all others, it is the freedom of commerce among the States under which that free trade which is the aspiration of philosophers is assured to all citizens of the Union, as they circulate through our whole broad country, without hindrance from any State."²

For reasons which are apparent, however, the decision did not at once have the full weight which has since been given to it. The judgment in *Willson vs. Blackbird Creek Marsh Company*,³ upholding a local regulation of commerce enacted by the State of Delaware, soon showed that the Federal power could not be, throughout its whole extent, exclusive of all State action. The doctrine was further limited by decisions establishing the validity of State grants of exclusive rights of ferriage over boundary streams;⁴ it was not applied to monopolies of transportation by land; and it appears, as late as 1866, to have been considered inapplicable to the monopoly for transportation between New York and Philadelphia which the State of New Jersey had granted to the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company.

State monopolies, therefore, continued; but, owing largely, no doubt, to the changed conditions of transportation, they were no longer created by prohibiting others to exercise the right allowed the grantee, as was done by Vermont in its grant to Levi Pease. Transportation had come to be conducted by corporations, and the State created a monopoly by refusing to give more than one corporation the right to transport between certain places. The whole subject of corporate charters was, it was held, within the jurisdiction of the State. These charters it might grant or withhold at pleasure. The uses to which they might be put were subject to State control alone. States could not be required to grant

¹ Address at Marshall Centennial, reported in 180 U. S., 671.

² Speech of Senator Sumner, February 14th, 1865. Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 2d Session, 793.

³ 2 Pet., 245.

⁴ *Conway vs. Taylor's Executor*, 1 Black, 603; *Louisville, etc., Ferry Company vs. Kentucky*, 188 U. S., 385; *State vs. Faudre* (West Va.) 46 S. E. Rep., 269.

a franchise, nor to divide jurisdiction over the creatures of their own legislation.¹

When the Erie Canal was built it was the policy of the State of New York to give to the canal a monopoly of transportation of merchandise between East and West. For this reason, when the Utica and Schenectady Railroad was incorporated, it was expressly enacted in the charter of the company that "no property of any description, except the ordinary baggage of passengers, shall be transported or carried on said road."² Subsequently,³ the Utica and Schenectady Railroad and other roads which now form part of the New York Central Railroad were authorized to transport goods, during the suspension of canal navigation, paying the Erie Canal Commissioners the toll which would have been required had the goods been carried on the canal. In 1847, these roads were authorized to transport merchandise during the whole year, but upon payment of tolls as before.⁴ The requirement of tolls was not abolished until 1851.⁵ It appears from statements made in Congress that these tolls were imposed upon the transportation of grain from the Northwest, and other inter-State freight.⁶

In 1833, the State of New Jersey granted to the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company a monopoly of transportation between New York and Philadelphia.⁷ This provision was sustained in the State Courts.⁸ In 1861, it was found that this company was unable to meet the demands for transportation of troops and supplies, and a Government quartermaster impressed another railroad and passed over it some eighteen thousand men and four hundred tons of freight. For this, the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company brought suit against the road so impressed, and recovered from it the money received for this service.⁹

¹ See argument of the Court in *Railroad Co. vs. Md.*, 21 Wall., 456.

² See New York Laws of 1833, Ch. 294, p. 462.

³ Laws of 1844, Ch. 335, p. 518. 1 Rev. Stats. N. Y., 3d ed., p. 219, Pt. 1, ch. IX., title 2, Sec. 40, 45.

⁴ Laws of 1847, c. 270, p. 298.

⁵ Laws of 1851, ch. 497.

⁶ Remarks of Senator Hale, February 14th, 1865, Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 2d Sess., 794.

⁷ Acts of N. J., 1829-30, 83—Harrison Co., N. J. Laws (1833), 284.

⁸ Camden & Amboy Ry. Co., Case 22, N. J. L., 623; Raritan, etc., Railroad Co. vs. Delaware, etc., Canal, 18 N. J. Eq., 546.

⁹ See Speech of Senator Sumner, February 14th, 1865, Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 2d Sess., 793; Senator Chandler, May 29th, 1866, Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 2,870; Senator Foot, January 15th, 1866, *id.* 227.

Besides the larger interests involved in these exclusive rights, there were also local interests connected with the railroads. "Nearly every railroad in its origin has been independent of all others, and in the early history of such roads they were commonly provided for as local conveniences, with no prevision of the great highways of trade and communication they have since become. It was in many cases thought to be important that a road should be kept as distinct in its business from all others as possible, and at their *termini* in some instances they were not allowed to have the same freight or passenger stations with other roads, lest the local draymen and hackmen should be deprived of a profitable employment."¹

It was on account of all these impediments in the way of free transportation, but chiefly on account of the military difficulties which arose from the Camden & Amboy monopoly, that Congress, on June 15, 1866, enacted that:

"Every railroad company in the United States, whose road is operated by steam, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to carry upon and over its road, boats, bridges and ferries, all passengers, troops, Government supplies, mails, freight, and property on their way from any State to another State, and to receive compensation therefor, and to connect with roads of other States so as to form continuous lines for the transportation of the same to the place of destination."

Thus the motion which was lost in the Second Congress in 1792 was, in a somewhat different form and with some limitations, renewed and passed seventy-four years later.

In the meanwhile, in 1851 the Supreme Court, in the case of *Cooley vs. Port Wardens*,² had reviewed the earlier decisions upon the nature of the Federal power over commerce, and had announced the rule which it is now said "may be considered as expressing the final judgment of the Court."

Mr. Justice Curtis in delivering the opinion in this case—his first constitutional opinion—said:

"The diversities of opinion, which have existed on this subject, have arisen from the different views taken of the nature of this power. But when the nature of a power like this is spoken of, when it is said that the

¹ 1st Ann. Rep. Int. Com., Council Bluffs *vs.* Kansas City R. Co., 45 Ia., 348.

² U. S. Rev. Stats., Sec. 5,258.

³ 12 How., 299, 319.

nature of the power requires that it should be exercised exclusively by Congress, it must be intended to refer to the subjects of that power, and to say they are of such a nature as to require exclusive legislation by Congress. Now, the power to regulate commerce embraces a vast field, containing not only many, but exceedingly various, subjects, quite unlike in their nature; some imperatively demanding a single uniform rule, operating equally on the commerce of the United States in every port; and some . . . as imperatively demanding that diversity which alone can meet the local necessities of navigation."

The rule was, therefore, established that, in all matters of a general nature, such as admit only of uniform regulation throughout the country, the Federal power is exclusive of all State action. In local matters, the States may legislate until their action is superseded by Congress. Pilotage, quarantine, inspection laws, and all those matters which are of purely domestic concern belong properly under this rule to the States, until their action be superseded by Congress. Matters which concern more than one State, on the other hand, are of national concern, and are within Federal jurisdiction alone.

It probably needs no argument to show that the organization and consolidation of inter-State railways, and the purchase or leasing of other lines of road,—if within the foregoing classification at all,—are matters of more than local interest and concern more States than one. If, therefore, laws on this subject be regulations of commerce, they have long been wholly beyond the competency of the States, and this, not because of any Federal statute, but because of the broad prohibition of the Constitution. The Sherman Anti-Trust law, if it have any application to such cases, is merely a statutory declaration, made in 1890, of a rule which has been recognized at all times since 1851, and whose origin traces back to 1824.

As a matter of fact, however, the great railway system of the country has been built under State law.¹ With comparatively few exceptions, the corporations have been organized by the States. From time to time, they have sold their property, or have purchased or leased the property of other companies, and have consolidated or merged with other railroads. All this has been and must still be done under State law.¹ Plainly, then, the control by a State of its own corporations, whether engaged in inter-State

¹ Louisville, etc., Ry. Co. *vs.* Kentucky, 161, U. S., 677-702.

commerce or not, has never until recently been considered a regulation of commerce. The primary relation of the carrier is to the State in which he operates. Federal control relates directly to but one of his functions, and to the carrier because of that function. What the nature of this control has been is well shown by the character of Federal legislation on the subject. Congress has required the use of safety appliances on railway cars, forbidden transportation of diseased cattle, etc., but has never interfered with State control of State corporations.

In the Northern Securities case a new step is taken, and a form of organization is declared illegal under Federal law because, in the language of the Circuit Court,¹ it amounted to a "virtual consolidation" of competing inter-State railway corporations. Whether the combination was illegal under State law, is beyond the present discussion. The Attorney-General contended that the States could not authorize such a consolidation, and so far as the opinion of the Supreme Court appears to sustain this contention, a new limitation is placed upon the powers of the States.

The foregoing discussion has traced in outline the increasing restriction upon the States. The growing authority of the central Government can also be traced affirmatively in the establishment of new Federal powers. This brings into view the history of the long struggle over internal improvements.

In the early days of the Constitution, there was no suggestion that the United States could, under its power over commerce, establish lines of communication between the States. It was argued that this might be done under the power to establish post-roads, but the view did not prevail, and where roads were built the sanction of the States was required.² Thus, on January 10th, 1803, Maryland passed a law "giving Congress power" to appropriate money for the repair of post-roads within the State, "provided that nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to authorize Congress to pass any law for changing the direction of the roads, or any of them, as now established, or to authorize them to pass a law for the opening of a new road." Even with this legislative consent the Federal power was doubted.³ Without State consent the Federal Government was powerless,

¹ *United States vs. Northern Securities Co.*, 120 Fed., 721.

² *Conf. Searight vs. Stokes*, 3 How., 151.

³ See Clay, *Speeches*, Vol. I., p. 69; Von Holst, *Const. Hist.*, 1750-1815, pp. 389-390; *Statesman's Manual* I., p. 491.

and sometimes the State would not consent. When Pennsylvania became fearful lest the Susquehanna River should form a highway whereby the products of that State and of New York should float to a market at Baltimore, rather than go to Philadelphia, laws were enacted by the legislature of Pennsylvania forbidding the removal of obstructions to the navigation of the river.¹ For this condition, the Federal Government could offer no relief. "Nobody has contended, and I presume that nobody will contend," said Senator Morrill, of Maine, in 1866, "that the right of eminent domain exists anywhere except in the States. Nobody ever did contend, and I am sure nobody ever will, that a right to land, the title to real estate, ever vested in the Government of the United States. . . . From the earliest period of this government down to the present time, never has the general Government undertaken to enter upon the soil of any State to exercise the right of eminent domain in its own right or to take possession of the soil of the several States, except by the consent of the States."² Land could be acquired then only by negotiation, or by eminent domain when this right was granted by a State. Many statutes of this sort were passed. An illustration is found in the Act of North Carolina of 1813,³ authorizing the United States to obtain sites for lighthouses and fortifications by application to the Governor of the State, who thereupon caused proceedings to be instituted in the State Courts for the condemnation of the needed property.

In 1875, the Federal power of eminent domain was established.⁴ "It is true," said the Court, "that this power of the Federal Government has not heretofore been exercised adversely; but the non-user of a power does not disprove its existence,"—a doctrine which Mr. Justice Bradley later extended, so that the power may be exercised within a State even over its protest. "In matters of foreign and inter-State commerce, there are no States."⁵

In the Northern Securities case, the Federal power is once more extended to control, in some respects, the corporate affairs of companies organized under State law to exercise these powers.

¹ Remarks of Senator James A. Bayard, of Delaware, February, 1807; *Annals* 9th Cong., 2d Session, 56.

² *Cong. Globe*, May 28th, 1866, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 2,853.

³ *Laws of 1796-1820*, chap. 857.

⁴ *Kohl vs. United States*, 91 U. S., 367.

⁵ *Stockton vs. Baltimore & N. Y. R. R. Co.*, 32 Fed., 9.

The grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce was given in broad terms, and was undefined. Monroe said that the creation of this power involved "a radical change in the whole system of our government,"¹ but there was no suggestion as to the specific nature of the change; while, on the other hand, as has been seen, the States continued to legislate as if no change had been made. The Federal authority as it exists to-day is the work of the national judiciary, and the decisions of the Supreme Court which mark its extent and its limitations are the enduring monument of the greatness of the men who have occupied that bench. "No instrument," said Judge Cooley, "can be the same in meaning to-day and forever and in all men's minds;" but the court, in the construction of the commerce clause, has persistently adhered to the original purpose of the framers of the Constitution under circumstances wholly unforeseen. Decisions like the recent one in the Securities case mark, in some respects, a change of law; but with greater truth they may be said to show how much more intimate are the commercial relations of these States than they were even thirty years ago.

E. PARMALEE PRENTICE.

¹ Bancroft, History of U. S., Vol. 6, p. 143.

THE GREAT WEST AND THE TWO EASTS.

BY HENRY E. REED, SECRETARY OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK CENTENNIAL, PORTLAND, OREGON.

A RESOUNDING chorus of congratulations will herald to the world the first centennials of two events upon which the history of the Great West is founded—the purchase of Louisiana and the journey of Lewis and Clark to the mouth of the Columbia River. Whether the students of history pause, at the St. Louis World's Fair in 1904, in admiration of the political foresight of Jefferson, or join, at Portland in 1905, in the general acclaim of the heroism of our first explorers, the fact that will most impress them is that geographical lines have been obliterated and that there is no West. Migrations, having their origin in the dim, remote past, and continuing down to the present, have brought the Aryan race face to face on the opposite shores of the great western ocean. The East that Columbus sailed westward from Spain to discover will ever be the world's East; the West, "the remote shores that Drake had once called by the name of New Albion," will be the East of the World's Great East, and the West only in its geographical relation to the Atlantic seaboard of our own country.

The West has refuted every prediction of dire effect made by the opponents of its acquisition. When the purchase of Louisiana was under consideration, the fear was expressed that people who moved to that region would scarcely ever feel the touch of the general government, their affections would be alienated by distance and American interests would become extinct among them. The generous response in men and money made by Missouri, Kansas and Iowa, when the Union was in the throes of a struggle for its preservation, attests the loyalty of the Louisiana region. A Southern Senator asked, in 1843, what good Oregon was for agricultural purposes, and said he would not give a pinch

of snuff for the whole territory. Yet the Oregon Country has given the Union three sovereign States, and part of its territory has been taken to form two other States; its occupation by Americans was a direct cause of the annexation of California; it has, in the Columbia River and Puget Sound, two important bases for military and naval operations; far from being inhospitable to the honest farmer of the Atlantic seaboard or the Ohio Valley, it has 100,000 farms, valued at \$600,000,000. Alaska was denounced as a barren waste, that would never add one dollar to our wealth or furnish homes to our people. Yet, in less than forty years, Alaska has supplied gold, fish and furs worth \$150,000,000, and has paid revenue to the government exceeding by \$1,500,000 the price Russia got for it in 1867. At no distant day, Hawaii and the Philippines will justify our occupation by like statistics.

If a non-expansive policy had prevailed in our national councils at the beginning of the nineteenth century; if the Presidential chair had been occupied by another than the broad statesman who saw beyond the Mississippi, over the Rockies to the Pacific, and over the Pacific to the cradle of the world, we should now have an intolerable situation of affairs in North America. Had we refused Louisiana from Napoleon, what is now the United States would be partitioned, geographically, about as follows: East of the Mississippi would be the Republic of the United States of America of 1783, with England in Canada on the north, and Spain in Florida and fringing the Gulf of Mexico. Louisiana would have fallen into England's hands as a result of the Napoleonic wars; and so, perhaps, would Oregon, either by reason of a favorable interpretation of the Nootka convention or Vancouver's discoveries. Mexico, as the successor of Spain, would own Texas and all the remainder of the West south of the 42nd parallel and not included in Louisiana. With a republic on one side, and European sovereignty on the other, the Mississippi would to-day be bristling with cannon. The purchase of Louisiana was due to political foresight, and the completion of our title to Oregon was a direct result of the Louisiana transaction. The war with Mexico was the logical sequence of both. From whatever point we may regard it, the acquisition of the Trans-Mississippi region, viewed in the perspective of a century, was worth what it cost in money, in actual war, and risk of war, with what, in our early history, was the most powerful nation on the globe.

The beginnings of the West date from 1850. Further back, the census reports do not present statistics that can be compared for valuable purposes with present standards, although as early as 1840 there were 900,000 people along the western shore of the Mississippi in Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana and Missouri. These States were long on the firing line of American civilization, and their people subsisted by general farming or by outfitting ox-team merchandise caravans for Santa Fé and Chihuahua, or by outfitting and trading with pioneer settlers *en route* to Oregon, or gold-seekers flocking to California. Jim Bridger put up in southwestern Wyoming in 1843 the first post for the purpose of trading built west of the Mississippi River; and its establishment marked the beginning of the era of emigration to the far West. Until a comparatively recent period, a goodly portion of the public domain lying west of the Missouri River, and comprising perhaps 500,000 square miles, was mapped as the "Great American Desert," and they who penetrated its solitudes and returned unscathed to "civilization" were viewed with the curiosity attaching to a traveller who has visited an unknown land. Progress in the half-century comprehended in this brief review has been remarkable. The present position of the West is shown in the appended table, which represents its percentages of the total for the United States for the different items tabulated. In a few cases comparisons are made from 1890 and 1850:

	1900.	1890.	1850.
Gross area with Alaska.....	75.4	—	—
Gross area without Alaska.....	59.1	—	—
Population, gross	27.5	26.6	8.6
Urban population	17.6	a13.1	14.1
Number of farms	35.8	32.6	8.2
Acres improved	48.8	44.4	6.3
Farms, total valuation.....	44.1	a36.7	6.9
Farm products, value	43.2	a37.4	20.3
Farm animals	59.4	—	11.9
Wool, yield	69.8	—	4.7
Hops, yield	64.3	—	7.1
Timber, area	55.4	—	—
Lumber product, value	32.4	24.9	10.0
Gold, yield	99.6	—	—
Silver, commercial value	99.8	—	—
Coal	15.1	—	—
Railroad mileage	45.2	—	0.25
Manufactures, value product	16.1	14.5	3.9
Operatives in factories	12.2	11.9	3.1
Imports and exports	19.0	—	—

a For 1870.

POPULATION.

The aggregate population has increased 957 per cent. in fifty years, and foreign population has grown faster than native:

	1900.	1890.	1850.	Per cent. Increase. 1850-1900.
Americans	18,375,337	14,117,931	1,785,462	929
Foreigners	2,659,317	2,556,478	213,942	1,143
Total.....	21,034,654	16,674,409	1,999,404	957
Per cent. American..	87.3	84.6	89.2	
Per cent. foreign....	12.7	15.4	10.8	

The percentage of native-born, which suffered a sharp decline between 1850 and 1890, because of the influx of foreigners to the mines of California, Montana and Nevada and to the farm lands of Minnesota and the Dakotas, is again in the ascendant, the net gain for the decade just ended having been 2.7 per cent. The native population is largest in the group of southwestern States and Territories, Arkansas leading with 98.9 per cent., Indian Territory 98.8 per cent., Louisiana 96.2 per cent. Along the Pacific Coast it is highest in Oregon with 84.1 per cent., and lowest in California with 75.3 per cent., Washington coming in between with 78.5 per cent. North Dakota, with 64.6 per cent., makes the poorest showing. The proportion of natives in the West, as a whole, in 1900 was 1 per cent. above the average for the Union, which was 86.3 per cent. The percentage of foreigners is highest in North Dakota, where it is 35.4, and lowest in Arkansas, where it is 1.1. Minnesota is the only State having over 500,000 foreigners. California and Iowa have over 300,000 each.

The population of the West in 1850 consisted of 1,500,000 farmers and traders in the Louisiana country, that is, Missouri, Iowa, Arkansas, Minnesota, 200,000 odd who had swarmed into Texas after it had been wrested from Mexico, some 60,000 in New Mexico, a group of gold-diggers in California, a few thousand Mormons in Utah, and a handful of hardy pioneers who had braved privations and hostile savages on the plains in following the footsteps of Lewis and Clark to the Oregon Country. At that time, there were not quite 2,000,000 people in all the boundless region west of the Mississippi River. The establishing of direct communication by the overland stage, followed by the building of the trans-continental railroad, stimulated growth; and by 1870

the West had attained considerable importance in population. In 1850, it reported 8.6 per cent. of the total population of the Union, 26.6 per cent. in 1890, and 27.5 per cent. in 1900. The appended table shows the progress in population:

State.	1850.	1890.	1900.
Arkansas	209,897	1,128,179	1,311,564
California	92,597	1,208,130	1,485,053
Colorado	—	412,198	539,700
Idaho	—	84,385	161,772
Iowa	192,214	1,911,896	2,231,853
Kansas	—	1,427,096	1,470,495
Louisiana	517,762	1,118,587	1,381,625
Minnesota	6,077	1,301,826	1,751,394
Missouri	682,044	2,679,184	3,106,665
Montana	—	132,159	243,329
Nebraska	—	1,058,910	1,066,300
Nevada	—	45,761	42,335
North Dakota	—	182,719	319,146
Oregon	13,294	313,767	413,536
South Dakota	—	328,808	401,570
Texas	212,592	2,235,523	3,048,710
Utah	11,380	207,905	276,749
Washington	—	349,390	518,103
Wyoming	—	60,705	92,531
Alaska	—	32,052	63,592
Arizona	—	59,620	122,931
Indian Territory	—	180,182	392,060
New Mexico	61,547	153,593	195,310
Oklahoma	—	61,834	398,331
Total.....	1,999,404	16,674,409	21,034,654

Louisiana, with 11.4 inhabitants to the square mile, was the most thickly settled State in the West in 1850. Missouri followed with 9.9; Arkansas with 4 and Iowa with 3.5. The average for the Union was 7.9. That year, the little State of Delaware, with 91,532 inhabitants, boasted of 1-263rd part of the total population of the Union. Where was Oregon with about one-seventh of Delaware's population and Minnesota with less than one-half of Oregon's? In 1900, the density of the Union was 25.6 inhabitants per square mile. Three States—Missouri with 45.2, Iowa with 40.2 and Louisiana with 30.4—exceeded the general average. In the remainder of the States, the density ranged from 0.4 in Nevada to 24.7 in Arkansas.

Throughout the West, with the exception of Louisiana, the number of females to each 100,000 males is under the national average of 95,353. Louisiana reports 98,871 and Utah for obvious reasons follows with 95,324. Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri

and Texas also have between 90,000 and 95,000 females to each 100,000 men, and in Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Indian Territory, New Mexico and Oklahoma, the average is over 85,000 and under 90,000. The proportion of women to each 100,000 men is exceedingly low in the Pacific Coast and Mountain States, being 80,987 in California, 73,265 in Idaho, 62,390 in Montana, 65,352 in Nevada, 77,495 in Oregon, 70,329 in Washington and 59,032 in Wyoming. Alaska reports 38,629.

Here, as in other parts of the Union, urban population is growing faster than rural. Comparison for this discussion is with the census of 1870, as the returns for any previous year make too meagre a showing. In 1870, the West had 56 of the 226 places that reported a population of 4,000 and over. In 1890, the number was 176 out of 899, and in 1900 it was 251 out of 1,158. Of the West's total population in 1900, 20.3 per cent. was urban, against 37.3 per cent. for the Union. In 1900, 17.6 per cent. of the total urban population of the country lived in the West, 13.1 per cent. in 1890 and 14.1 per cent. in 1870. California with 48.9 per cent. and Colorado with 41.2 are above the average for the Union, while Washington, with 36.4, makes a close approach to the mark. For other States the average is: Iowa 20.5; Kansas 19.2; Louisiana 25.1; Minnesota 31; Missouri 34.9; Montana and Wyoming 28.8; Nebraska 20.8; Oregon 27.6; Utah 29.4; Arkansas 6.9; Idaho 6.2; Nevada 10.6; North Dakota 7.2; Texas 14.9; Arizona 10.6; Indian Territory 2.5; New Mexico 6.1; Oklahoma 5. The following statement shows the drift of the population into the cities:

	1900.	1890.	1870	Increase per cent. 1870-1900.
Urban population.	5,024,876	3,723,427	1,145,033	338
Rural population.	16,009,778	12,950,982	5,732,063	179
Total.....	21,034,654	16,674,409	6,877,096	206

In 1870, St. Louis, New Orleans and San Francisco were the only cities that had over 100,000 population. In 1900, ten cities exceeded 100,000, while eight other cities, Portland leading the contingent, had between 50,000 and 100,000. Since 1880, Seattle had advanced from 151st place to 48th place in the rank of American cities; Los Angeles from 135th to 36th; Duluth from 152nd to 72nd; Kansas City, Kansas, from 155th to 76th; Portland

from 106th to 42nd; Tacoma from 157th to 104th; Spokane from 158th to 106th, and Dallas, Texas, from 137th to 88th.

AGRICULTURE.

The area of improved land in farms has increased nearly thirty-fold in fifty years, but has not kept pace with population:

	Acres Improved.			Acres per Inhabitant.		
	1900.	1890.	1850.	1900.	1890.	1850.
Arkansas	6,953,735	5,475,043	781,530	5.3	4.8	3.7
California	11,958,837	12,222,839	32,454	8.0	10.1	0.35
Colorado	2,273,968	1,823,520	—	4.2	4.4	—
Idaho	1,413,118	606,362	—	8.7	7.0	—
Iowa	29,897,552	25,428,899	824,682	13.3	13.3	4.2
Kansas	25,040,550	22,303,301	—	17.0	15.6	—
Louisiana	4,666,532	3,774,668	1,590,025	3.3	3.3	3.0
Minnesota	18,442,585	11,127,953	5,035	16.2	8.5	0.83
Missouri	22,900,043	19,792,313	2,938,425	7.3	7.3	4.3
Montana	1,736,701	915,517	—	7.1	6.8	—
Nebraska	18,432,595	15,247,705	—	17.3	14.4	—
Nevada	572,946	723,052	—	13.2	15.8	—
North Dakota	9,644,520	4,658,015	—	30.2	26.0	—
Oregon	3,328,308	3,516,000	132,857	8.0	11.2	9.9
South Dakota	11,285,983	6,959,293	—	28.1	21.1	—
Texas	19,576,076	20,746,215	643,976	6.4	9.2	3.0
Utah	1,032,117	548,223	16,333	3.7	2.1	1.4
Washington	3,465,960	1,820,832	—	6.6	5.2	—
Wyoming	792,332	476,831	—	8.5	7.8	—
Alaska	159	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	227,739	104,128	—	1.8	1.7	—
Indian Territory ..	3,062,193	—	—	7.8	—	—
New Mexico	326,873	263,106	166,201	1.7	1.7	—
Oklahoma	5,511,994	563,728	—	13.8	9.0	—
Total	202,543,416	159,097,543	7,131,518	9.6	9.5	3.56

The new farms opened since 1850 are nearly equal, in the aggregate, to the land area of the original thirteen States. The new farms opened between 1890 and 1900 equal more than the combined land areas of the States of Tennessee and West Virginia. North Dakota, with a little over 300,000 population, has more land under farms by 1,500,000 acres than has all New England with 5,600,000 people. The average number of improved acres per inhabitant more than doubled in the West between 1850 and 1890, and showed in 1900 a slight increase over 1890.

The West has 2,056,748 farms, as against 1,491,405 in 1890 and 119,510 in 1850. Texas, with 352,190, leads the Union, and Missouri, with 284,886, holds second place. Iowa has 37,000 more farms than all the New England States combined. While

the West has not quite half the improved acreage of the country, it has 63 per cent. of the unimproved acreage, or 269,000,000 acres out of 426,400,000. Farms average in size from 93.1 acres in Arkansas to 885.9 acres in Montana, 1,174.7 acres in Nevada and 1,333 acres in Wyoming, where stock-raising predominates and requires large ranges. The average for the West is 229.1 acres, against 146.6 acres for the Union.

The proportion of the total land area in farms ranges from 3.7 per cent. in Nevada to 97.4 per cent. in Iowa. Kansas has 79.7, Missouri 77.3, Texas 74.9, Oklahoma 63, Nebraska 60.8, and Minnesota 51.8. No other State has 50 per cent. In the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States, the average, considering the capabilities of the soil, is surprisingly low. California reports 28.9, Washington 19.9, Oregon 16.6, Wyoming 13, Montana 12.7, Utah 7.8 and Idaho 5.9. Iowa leads the nation in this respect, followed by Indiana with 94.1, Ohio with 93.9 and Illinois with 91.5. It is from these four States, whose areas are so largely taken up and whose land values are high, that the extreme West is seeking, by reason of its cheap lands and equable climate, to draw its new population. East of the Mississippi River, the percentage ranges in New England from 32.9 in Maine to 80.8 in Vermont. Along the Atlantic Coast, the average is from 59 per cent. in New Jersey to 85 per cent. in Delaware. Ohio, Indiana and Illinois have already been shown in comparison with Iowa. Kentucky has 85.9, Tennessee 76.1, Wisconsin 57 and Michigan 47.8. The values are as follows:

Total Farm Values.	The Union.	The West.	Per cent. in West.
1900	\$20,514,001,838	\$9,155,558,744	44.1
1890	15,982,267,689	5,872,985,782	36.7
1850	3,967,343,580	276,464,837	6.9

Value Farm Products.	The Union.	The West.	Per cent. in West.
1900	\$4,739,118,752	\$2,050,766,816	43.2
1890	2,460,197,454	920,823,920	37.4
1870*	2,447,538,658	499,092,093	20.3

* Not reported by United States census prior to 1870. Values for this year in depreciated currency. To get true value, reduce one-fifth.

Productions in quantity of principal crops in the West in 1890 and 1850, and percentages of the total for those years, are thus shown:

Product.	Yield, 1900.	Yield, 1850.	Per cent. of total, 1900.	Per cent. of total, 1850.
Wheat, bush.....	431,963,900	5,288,868	65.5	5.2
Corn, bush.....	1,363,983,943	70,467,713	51.1	11.9
Barley, bush....	93,767,657	47,709	78.2	0.92
Buckwheat, bush.	312,456	77,341	2.7	0.86
Oats, bush.....	454,460,412	7,849,962	48.1	5.3
Rye, bush.....	7,705,168	76,255	30.1	0.53
Total grain, bush.	2,352,193,536	83,807,848	53.1	9.6
United States ..	4,424,800,923	867,453,967	—	—
* Butter, lbs.....	390,810,814	15,184,444	36.4	4.8
* Cheese, lbs.....	7,609,331	614,732	46.4	0.58
Flaxseed, bush...	19,791,647	16,010	99.0	0.28
Hay, tons.....	44,799,194	253,297	53.3	1.8
Potatoes, bush...	87,288,453	1,764,969	31.9	2.6
Hops, lbs.....	31,673,821	12,719	64.3	7.1

* Made on farms only.

The West leads the East in flocks and herds, viz.:

	The Union.		The West.	
	1900.	1850.	1900.	1850.
Dairy cows	17,139,674	6,385,094	7,011,333	722,221
Other neat cattle.	50,682,662	11,393,813	35,585,356	1,756,059
Mules and asses..	3,366,724	559,331	1,655,654	122,371
Horses	18,280,007	4,336,719	10,063,260	528,459
Sheep	39,937,573	21,723,220	26,940,389	1,628,159
Lambs	21,668,238	—	13,632,117	—
Swine	62,876,108	30,354,213	32,274,381	4,193,895
Total.....	213,950,986	74,752,390	127,162,490	8,951,164
Per cent.....	—	—	59.4	11.9

MANUFACTURING.

The centre of area in the United States, excluding Alaska and recent acquisitions, is in Northern Kansas, the centre of population in Indiana, and the centre of manufactures in Ohio. Manufacturing in the West is of minor importance, though the aggregate of output exceeded the agricultural output in 1900 by over \$50,000,000. Relatively, its position is not so strong, being but 16.1 per cent. of the total, against 27.5 per cent. for population and 43.2 per cent. for value of farm products. Manufacturing increased substantially in the 1890 and 1900 decade and materially in the past fifty years. Thus:

	1900.	1890.	1850.
Value product.....	\$2,104,940,868	\$1,367,835,887	\$40,398,488
No. operatives	652,561	508,371	30,084
Dollars per operative	2,991	2,690	1,342
Per cent. of total:—			
Product	16.1	14.5	3.9
Operatives	12.2	11.9	3.1

Missouri is the principal State for manufactures, California the second and Minnesota the third. These States stand for nearly half the total output of Western factories. The output of California, Oregon and Washington, in 1900, was \$435,670,399, constituting 3.3 per cent. of the value of products for the United States. Commenting on this, we find the census of Manufactures (part 1, Page CLXXVIII.) saying:

"The industrial conditions in this group of States in 1900, considering the value, but not the character, of the products, was about the same as the New England States in 1860 and the Middle States in 1850. From this point of view, the growth of the Pacific States has been remarkable. The character of its industries is still determined largely by its natural resources of farm, forest and mine, but the recent wars in the Orient, resulting in the opening of new markets, gave to the industries of this section stimulus which had only begun to be felt at the time the twelfth census was taken."

COMMERCE.

The combined imports and exports of the United States in the year ended June 30, 1901, were geographically distributed as follows: New York 45.73 per cent.; other ports east of the Mississippi River, 35.24 per cent.; the West (Pacific and Gulf ports) 19.03. Of the seven great ports in the Union, three are in the West, New Orleans ranking third, Galveston sixth and San Francisco seventh. New Orleans has a foreign commerce of \$173,000,000 a year; Galveston \$102,000,000, and San Francisco \$70,000,000. Puget Sound and the Columbia River, where before many years will be large ports, have between them \$40,000,000. Of the total exports of the United States in 1901, the West reported \$354,682,075, or 23.1 per cent. Exports were \$86,275,443, or 10.4. Breadstuffs form a considerable item of the exports of Western ports. For the ten years ended June 30, 1901, shipments were 240,000,000 bushels of barley, corn, oats, rye; 450,000,000 bushels of wheat and 26,000,000 barrels of wheat-flour, of a total value of \$521,000,000. San Francisco led in this business, with New Orleans second and Portland third.

MINERAL PRODUCTION.

Ever since the discovery of gold in California in 1848, mining has been one of the most important industries of the West. Between 1848 and 1900, California yielded gold valued at \$1,385,-

197,097, about one-eighth the total gold-production of the world from 1493 to 1900. The West in 1900 produced 99.6 per cent. of the nation's gold, 99.8 per cent. of its silver (commercial value), and 15.1 per cent. of its coal, viz.:

	Gold.	Silver.	Total Value.
California	\$15,816,200	\$583,668	\$16,399,868
Colorado	28,829,400	12,700,018	41,529,418
Idaho	1,724,700	3,986,042	5,710,742
Montana	4,698,000	8,801,148	13,499,148
Nevada	2,006,200	842,394	2,848,594
Oregon	1,694,700	71,548	1,766,248
South Dakota	6,177,600	332,444	6,510,044
Utah	3,972,200	5,745,912	9,718,112
Alaska	8,171,000	45,446	8,216,446
Arizona	4,193,400	1,857,210	6,050,610
Texas, etc.....	1,587,100	704,568	2,291,668
Total.....	\$78,870,500	\$35,670,398	\$114,540,898

Other mineral productions in 1900 are 30,000,000 tons of coal; 200,000 short tons of lead; 413,000,000 pounds of copper; 3,600,000 barrels of petroleum, and 30,000 flasks of quicksilver. The copper-mines of Montana and Arizona have lessened the importance of the Lake Superior region as a source of supply, cutting its percentage of the total American output from 62.9 in 1882, to 25.9 in 1899.

One of the greatest gold-mining regions of the world is located in Eastern Oregon, and covers a gross area of between 3,000 and 4,000 square miles. Professor J. Waldemar Lindgren, of the United States Geological Survey, believes that the strong, well-defined veins upon which most of the important mines of this region are located will continue to the greatest depths yet attained in mining.

LUMBER INDUSTRY.

According to the census reports for 1900, lumber is excelled in value among American productions only by iron and steel, textiles and slaughtering and meat-packing. The West will surely be paramount in this important industry. Indeed, we, thus early, find the Director of the Census making this important admission in one (203) of his bulletins:

"The white pine area in the Northwest has passed its maximum of production and the attention of lumbermen is being diverted from this region to the Southern pine forests and to the enormously heavy forests

of the Northwest Coast, which will, in the course of a decade or two, become the chief source of lumber for the country."

Texas, with 64,000 square miles, leads the Union in wooded area. Oregon is second, with 54,300 square miles, and Minnesota third, with 52,200 square miles. Arkansas, California, Missouri, Montana and Washington each have over 40,000 square miles of wooded area. Oregon, Washington and California have at least one-third of the standing timber of the country. The redwood forest of California is, perhaps, the densest forest, measured by the amount of lumber per acre, in the world. In quantity of standing timber, Oregon leads the Union, with 300 billion feet; California is second, with 200 billion feet and Washington third with nearly 196 billion feet. Minnesota, with a product of \$43,600,000, leads the West, and Washington is second, with \$30,300,000. The total value of the lumber product of the West in 1900 was \$184,135,988, against \$109,201,667 in 1890 and \$6,075,896 in 1850. The lumber cut was 10,925,736 M. feet, board measure, or a little less than one-third of the output of the Union. Among Western States, Minnesota led, with 2,342,388 M. feet. Arkansas was second, with 1,623,987 M. feet and Washington third, with 1,429,032 M. feet. Oregon cut 734,528 M. feet.

RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

The transcontinental railroads have brought the West up to its present state of development, for they have opened it to settlement, and provided reasonable rates for the transport of its products to the Eastern markets, even if at the same time they have exposed its infant manufacturing industries to the competition of the large capitalization of the Atlantic seaboard and the Ohio Valley. In 1850, the West had 79½ miles of railroad, all in Louisiana. All the rest of the westward stretch of the nation to the Pacific was without so much as a single rail. What Louisiana could so proudly boast of in 1850, was less than the mileage then operated by the Boston and Maine and its branches in Massachusetts. By 1900, the total had swelled to 87,406.13 miles out of the 193,345.78 miles in the United States, and the percentage from .25 to 45.2. On the basis of miles of railroad per 100 square miles of territory, Iowa leads with 16.56 and Nevada is lowest with .83. In miles of line per 10,000 inhabitants, Nevada is first with 214.98, and Louisiana last with 20.44.

In view of the enormous railroad construction in the West in the past thirty years, it is worth while to recall President Buchanan's telegram to John Butterfield, the pioneer of Western overland transportation, when the first direct overland mail arrived by stage at St. Louis from San Francisco in 1858:

"I cordially congratulate you upon the result. It is a glorious triumph for civilization and the Union. Settlements will soon follow the course of the road, and the East and the West will be bound together by a chain of living Americans which can never be broken."

FINANCE.

In 1850, there were 31 banks west of the Mississippi—25 in Louisiana and 6 in Missouri, with deposits aggregating \$9,500,000. On July 16th, 1902, the individual deposits in national banks amounted to \$639,180,306, and the loans and discounts to \$615,116,949.

FUTURE OF THE WEST.

The future of the Great West must be considered from two view-points. (1) In its relation to the Asiatic countries and their trade; and (2) in its ability to support a large population.

Asia and Oceanica comprise an area of 21,262,718 square miles, and have a population of 847,000,000, or more than half that of the globe. Of this number, 435,000,000 are in China and its dependencies, Japan, Asiatic Russia and Corea. Asia and the islands of the Pacific annually buy from the world goods valued at \$1,446,000,000 and sell to it, goods of a value of \$1,436,000,000 representing a total trade of \$2,882,000,000. The United States will in time have a tremendous trade across the Pacific, although at present our proportion of the business is inconsiderable. In the year ended June 30, 1901, only 9.25 per cent. of our foreign commerce was with Asia and Oceanica, of which 2.17 per cent. was with the British East Indies, 2.09 per cent. with Japan, 1.67 per cent. with Chinese ports, and .37 with the Philippines. The new theatre of the world's activities is a virgin field, as little understood on our Pacific seaboard as on our Atlantic seaboard; for the exporters of both sections make the same mistakes in packing, and in long-range dealing with the Oriental customer, to whom the first essential in trade is what our consular officers persistently pour into unwilling ears as the "look, see," or the

privilege of inspecting the commodity offered for sale, before buying it. These, however, are details of commercial organizations which our exporters can be depended upon to settle on a satisfactory basis. The fear expressed in some quarters at the opening of Siberia by the completion of the great Russian railroad, and the consequent development of a region that will become a competitor of the United States in the trans-Pacific country, would appear to be groundless so far as any detrimental effect upon our country is concerned. Our general development is based upon the attraction of our institutions, the freedom of industry, the cheapness and fertility of our lands, our hospitable climate, and above all, on the long enjoyment of the guarantees of peace.

Viewing the future of the West from the point of view of its ability to support a large population, the measure must be the record of the half-century just past. It has done more than its most sanguine friend dared foretell for it a century ago, and it is not half developed. Excluding Alaska, it has an area of 2,138,488 square miles and a population of 20,971,062, with a density of 9.8. The population density of the Union is 25.6 to the square mile. The West is capable of reaching this mark; and, on this basis, its population would be, approximately, 55,000,000, a little more than the States east of the Mississippi had in 1900. Every foot of the West is useful for some purpose, the purpose depending in some degree upon the success of irrigation. The high lands of Nevada are no more to be ignored, in the general scheme of economy, than the irregular and broken surface of Vermont, where intensive cultivation of the soil now obtains as a result of Western competition in agriculture. When one contemplates the rugged mountains of Idaho, Eastern Montana, Northern California, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico, he should reflect that somewhere in this broad land cattle must have range, if the price of meat is to be kept within bounds. Conditions for horticulture and agriculture in Louisiana are as favorable as in any other State in the Union. The Columbia River basin in Oregon, Washington and Idaho, is an empire in itself, with a population less than Chicago, and Eastern Oregon under irrigation could produce 100,000,000 bushels of grain. There are those who expect Alaska to take station as an agricultural community. Manufactures in the West will ultimately bear a close ratio to population.

The West comes on the stage of the world's activity in an era of peace, prosperity and advancement of American principles and institutions. Its loyalty to the Union never has been doubted, and no cloud of discord appears to bring it into contest with the East, for its interests are identical with those of that section, and community of interest promotes community of purpose. The West, instead of proving the destroyer of the nation, has proved its savior. What the future is to be, in all its aspects, no man can say. The Briton would have been thought insane ten years ago who would have dared to predict the day that Canada, Australia and New Zealand would be called upon to uphold the prestige of the Empire at the Cape of Good Hope. No American, however pessimistic, contemplates with pleasure the possibility of war; still, every American is pleased to see his country protected against the day of war. The generation that was contemporaneous with the statesman who said Oregon was not worth a pinch of snuff, left sons and daughters to see an Oregon regiment sailing away from San Francisco to plant the Stars and Stripes at Manila, and raise the United States to the dignity of a World Power. And, in that city whose legislative halls echoed with dire warnings as to what should happen if Louisiana should be accepted from Napoleon, the citizen of some future day may be gladdened by the sight of a regiment from the Yukon River marching down the broad avenues in the defence of the national capital.

HENRY E. REED.

THE MANUSCRIPT SOURCES FOR AMERICAN HISTORY.

BY HERBERT PUTNAM, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

WITH reference to sources, the student of foreign history has heretofore been better situated than the student of American history. To a considerable extent, the material which concerns him has been centralized and systematized for his use, and placed under the conduct of experts; that which consists of archives,—that is, documents accumulated in actual administration, which record the transactions of government and are indispensable for the study of that part of history which is “past politics”—does, indeed, to a large extent, remain still with the department of the government whose operations created them or brought them together. But in certain countries the archives have been dissociated from such departments and centralized in a Record Office. The Record Office in London is, of course, the most prominent and the noblest example of intelligent effort in this direction; but most foreign countries can show some effort of a similar nature. Even Spain, supposed to be more fond of tradition than systematic in preserving and making available the evidence of it, has gathered at Simancas most of the archive material within reach of the government not already in safe custody at Madrid and Seville; and there, in a huge castle, remote from the perils of ordinary traffic and solid against assault by fire or time, preserves it for the use of the investigator. Of nearer fields of research we have examples on our borders: Mexico has its Record Office, seriously, courteously and hospitably administered, where are similarly preserved and made accessible the manuscript governmental records of its past, so far as these have survived revolution and earlier neglect; while Canada maintains both a Record Office and a trained archivist, who has not merely systematized and

made accessible the material at home, but has caused to be made and brought to Ottawa transcripts of documents in London which are important to the student of Canadian history.

The material in private hands has tended to drift into public libraries. In Great Britain, great masses of it still remain in private hands, but this has been brought to the surface by the British Government through its Historical Manuscripts Commission, which has compiled and published extensive indexes and calendars of the manuscript sources in private collections.

Again, the student of the history of a foreign country finds, if not all, certainly the main sources for his work within the confines of that country. There are notable exceptions. The attempt of the first Napoleon to centralize at Paris the archives of the regions subject to the imperial control, was only in part undone later; and an inestimable number of manuscripts still remain in the office of the French Government which the student would once have looked for at Madrid, at Rome, at Vienna, or in a dozen other centres of historic event. The student of the Elizabethan period may find most illuminating suggestion as to the England of that day in the reports made by the Venetian envoys to their home government. There is at Rome so much material important to the investigator in British history, that the British Government maintains there a permanent agent, whose duty is to search it out and report it. Original court records indispensable to the student of diplomacy were once "ambulatory": they followed various sovereigns in their migrations of policy or of conquest, and now rest far beyond the present limits of the regions which they concern. But, even making due allowance for such dispersion and eccentricity, the total area of the regions to be searched is comparatively small.

The student of American history has to meet a situation very different. For the Colonial period, and for certain relations of a generation succeeding it, his most important material is still abroad. He is separated from it, not by the English Channel and a slight expense, but by the Atlantic and a considerable expense. His national Government has as yet done nothing to bring it to him: the small amount thus far done,—the collection of a few fragments,—having been the praiseworthy but inadequate achievement of a few local authorities, societies or institutions. For the manuscript sources of American history in the possession of Gov-

ernment the investigator is dependent not upon one government, but on his national Government *plus* forty-five others,—very variant in the intelligence to comprehend his need, and in the desire and capacity to meet it.

The material for colonial history, so far as it exists in this country, is for the most part in a few libraries (such as the Lenox), in the custody of societies, or with the local governments that are the literary as well as the political successors of the colonies. That which is "archive" has to some extent been published by State or municipal authority. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland have been especially zealous in such publication; but, of the thirteen original States, all but Delaware, Georgia and South Carolina have done something. North Carolina, whose early records are, for the most part, in London, has even caused transcripts of these to be made, deposited with its Secretary of State, and published. Where the public authorities have been inert, a local historical society has here and there undertaken the task—as in Delaware, where it has published the "Minutes of the Council of the Delaware State from 1776 to 1792." Even where the State has put into print all within its control, there has still been need of industry on the part of such societies, for a great mass of material properly "archive" is not with the State, but with them. It is indeed a whimsical, as well as inconvenient, circumstance that the sources for our history prior to 1790 should be so scattered, and to such a large extent in private collections. The court records of Barnstable County, Massachusetts, from 1663 to 1673, are in possession of the Historical Society of New Hampshire; the town papers of Dover, New Hampshire, 1693-1783, are in the State Library of New York, which contains also items as exotic as the early Court Register of Stafford County in Virginia, and the original Minutes for 1776-80 of the South Carolina Navy Board. Important early records of Virginia, including the Records of the Virginia Company itself, 1619-24, and the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Virginia Council from 1622 to 1627, came to the Library of Congress with the collection of President Jefferson. The official letter-books and official diary of Robert Morris, as Superintendent of Finance from 1781 to 1784, distinctly public records, were for thirty years in the possession of General Meredith Read (who

had bought them in a junk-shop), and were only three years ago acquired for the National Library from his widow. One would expect to find in the Navy Department the log-books of our naval officers; but in the earlier years it was the custom to consider these the private property of such officers, and many are now appearing in the market, as if ordinary private diaries. Those, for instance, of Commodore Preble were acquired by Government only within the past year, in the purchase of the Preble Papers by the Library of Congress.

These are but examples of a condition which, in 1900, led a committee of Congress to report that "hardly any State possesses at present complete files, either in manuscript or in print, of its own records. Some of the records appear never to have been systematically preserved. Some have been lost. Some are in the possession of other States or of the national Government. Large portions exist in manuscript only; while others, the originals of which have disappeared, are in printed volumes now scarce and virtually impossible of replacement."

For the post-Revolutionary periods the conditions have been little more satisfactory. The material is not, indeed, so much scattered; it is for the most part in this country; and it is chiefly in public offices. But it has been exploited to a very small extent. It has received far less attention from the historical societies, which, as Professor Jameson has remarked, "pay twice as much attention to the period of exploration and first settlement as to all the rest of the Seventeenth Century, twice as much to the period anterior to 1700 as to that from 1700 to 1775, and none whatever to that since the Revolution." Certain of the western States subsidize the researches and publications of historical societies, which, of course, deal with post-Revolutionary history. A few States—such as Iowa, Alabama and Mississippi—now maintain archivists, whose duty it is to seek everywhere the literary sources of their early history, and to bring to the State capitals the record of them in indexes, calendars or actual transcripts. But these undertakings are as yet sporadic.

As to the national archives, the committee of Congress, already quoted, reported that "at present no lawyer or historical student, desiring to consult the archives of the national Government, can feel in advance any assurance that the papers to which he wishes access are to be found in the place in Washington where they

would naturally be supposed to be, or even that they are actually in the possession of the United States at all. . . . Documents of the utmost legal importance, affecting personal and governmental interests of great magnitude, are scattered about among the executive Departments and Bureaus, and are often stored under conditions which not only make access to them difficult, but also open the way to the mutilation or loss of the documents themselves."

The report of this committee (the House Committee on the Library) accompanied and explained a bill, which called upon the American Historical Association to investigate the character and condition of the archives and public records of the several States and Territories, and of the United States, and to report to Congress results and recommendations. The bill did not pass. But the Association has proceeded without governmental aid, except in publication. It has maintained two commissions,—one (created in 1895) to investigate and exploit the manuscript sources in private hands, thus paralleling for the United States the work of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of Great Britain; the other, The Public Archives Commission (created in 1899), to report upon those in public offices, without, however, any design of publication. The work of these commissions has been purely voluntary, the subsidies granted by the Association being applied merely to clerical and incidental expenses. It has resulted in the publication in the annual reports of the Association of useful statements as to existing manuscript sources. These cover already the character, scope and condition of the public archives of twelve States, and of the cities of New York and Philadelphia, and the legislative journals of the several Colonial Assemblies; they include a convenient list of the items relating to American history in the private collections of Great Britain, drawn off from the reports of the English Historical Manuscripts Commission; and they have reproduced in full certain manuscript material—such as the Correspondence of Clark and Genet, and the Calhoun letters—not heretofore generally available.

Moreover, a recommendation of a committee of this Association has induced the Carnegie Institution to undertake a portion of the very investigation which had been the purpose of the proposed legislation by Congress. This is the examination of the public records of the national Government at Washington. A grant for

such an examination was the first grant made by the Institution in the interest of historical research. The investigation under it, begun in February of last year, has been completed; and the resultant report, shortly to be published, will contain the fullest statement, the most detailed and competent analysis, yet made as to the manuscript sources for history in the possession of the Government at Washington.

A further recommendation of this advisory committee has induced the authorities of the Carnegie Institution to establish at Washington an agency for the utilization of the manuscript sources there. It includes a Director of Historical Research, who, among other functions, is to aid investigators, including student workers, to a prompt and intelligent use of the historical material which the report reveals.

That a large part of this material is not at present either logically placed or most conveniently accessible, has been obvious enough. It is of three classes: official records necessary to present administration, archives proper, and historical manuscripts literary in character. It should be divided among the executive Departments, a Record Office and the National Library. But the United States Government has no Record Office; and until recently has had no National Library with accommodations appropriate to the custodianship of important manuscript material. As a result, not merely archives but historical manuscripts entirely unrelated to administration have been accumulated in the executive Departments. They have, indeed, accumulated in such an overwhelming mass as to impede and afflict administration, and induce incessant appeals to Congress for relief, through increased accommodations or the establishment of separate facilities for storage. These appeals have at last been successful, and an appropriation has been granted for the construction of a building to which the Departments may send such of their files as cannot longer be accommodated in their offices, and are yet of a value which should preclude their destruction. Whether this institution will expand into a Record Office is yet to be seen. A mere storage warehouse is *not* a Record Office. It may preserve; but, without expert service and a positive duty of research, it cannot make useful the material.

The material for which it will provide will, however, be archives proper; that is, the documents which have accumulated through

the direct operations of the Government.* From time to time, the Government has, however, come into the possession of historical manuscripts distinctly literary in character. Certain of these—such as the papers of the Marquis de Rochambeau, and those accumulated by Peter Force in the compilation of his archives—were deposited in the Library of Congress. Others went to executive Departments—especially the Department of State. But the conditions which directed them thither have ceased to exist. The Library of Congress is now the National Library, with a building both safe and ample, and with elaborate equipment for the care of manuscript material. It maintains a department specially and exclusively devoted to this, and under conduct of an expert of high repute as an authority in the sources of American history; and its duty is not merely to acquire and preserve these sources, but to make them useful. Accordingly, Congress has now enacted† that:

“The head of any executive Department or Bureau, or any commission of the Government, is hereby authorized from time to time to turn over to the Librarian of Congress, for the use of the Library of Congress, any books, maps or other material in the Library of the Department, Bureau or commission no longer needed for its use, and in the judgment of the Librarian of Congress appropriate to the uses of the Library of Congress.”

* For instance: the records of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department. They contain material for the history of our postal system from its beginnings. They should not be destroyed. But when the Department moved to its new building, five years ago, there was no space available for them, and the huge mass—12,000 volumes, weighing over a hundred tons—was actually without a home. They were offered to the Library of Congress, as a deposit. But an examination of them showed that, while material for an archive office, they were not material for a library. A third of them were later sent to a pulp-mill, and the remainder placed on temporary storage in a rented building. The original returns of the first Census were, a couple of years ago, ordered to be scattered among the several States, or, failing hospitality there, to be destroyed. The order was given by Congress under a misapprehension as to their value to the economist and the genealogist; and its operation was happily postponed, until now it may be averted; but the issue of it illustrates the peril to which original sources are subject in the absence of a Record Office and a responsible archivist. The files of Senate and House have been in constant peril—from heat, moisture, inability or indifference. Those of the House have indeed suffered from actual depredation. A large mass of them—some 6,000 volumes—were lately brought to the Library of Congress for temporary safety. Among them, in the general unappreciated mass, were the originals of Hamilton's great report upon Manufacture and that upon a National Bank, signed by him.

† In the appropriation act for the present year.

The first important transfer to be made under this act was embodied in the following executive order issued on March 9th, 1903:

"The historical archives in the Department of State, known as the Revolutionary archives, and comprising (1) the records and papers of the Continental Congress [307 vols.]; (2) the papers of George Washington [299 vols.]; (3) the papers of James Madison [75 vols.]; (4) the papers of Thomas Jefferson [137 vols.]; (5) the papers of Alexander Hamilton [65 vols.]; (6) the papers of James Monroe [22 vols.]; (7) the papers of Benjamin Franklin [32 vols.], are by authority provided by the act of Congress entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes,' approved February 25, 1903, hereby ordered to be transferred from the Department of State—with such exceptions and reservations, in each collection herein enumerated, as in the discretion of the Secretary of State may be required for the continuity and completeness of the records and archives of the Department of State—to the possession and custody of the Library of Congress, to be there preserved and rendered accessible for historical and other legitimate uses, under such rules and regulations as may from time to time be prescribed by the Librarian of Congress. . . . The transfer here directed shall be made on the 1st day of July, 1903, or as promptly thereafter as shall be found conveniently practicable to the Department of State and the Library of Congress.

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

"White House, March 9, 1903."

This transfer has required, of course, the cooperation of the authorities of the State Department, which has been entirely prompt and cordial. It assumes that papers of importance to the investigator in history, and not necessary for administrative purposes, will render a larger service to scholarship if in the Library, which has a specific duty not merely to preserve them, but to make them accessible, than in an Executive Department where this service is purely voluntary and is not sustained by specific appropriation. The principle is one that will doubtless apply generally. The transfer leaves the ownership, control and possession still with the Government. It merely utilizes, as custodian, a different Government agency now deemed more appropriate.

The historical manuscripts in which the Federal Government has title, and for whose preservation and utility it is responsible, are not limited to those in the Departments at Washington. Others have come to it with the acquisition of new territory,

others still through the operation of its customs system at various ports of entry. Among the former were the archives at Porto Rico, at Guam and in the Philippines. Those at San Juan were, by order of the War Department, brought to Washington and sorted over, and those deemed appropriate for preservation there were retained in the Library, the remainder being returned. The archives at Guam would naturally be of value as illustrating and epitomizing, in one secluded province, the course and method of Spanish colonial administration during several centuries. They had been reported to include three items of peculiar interest: the letter-books of the Spanish Governors, containing their correspondence with the Governor-General of the Philippines, to whose jurisdiction they became subject after the independence of Mexico; the Reports of the Residencias, or courts of inquiry, which were held at the end of the administration of every Governor; and the inventory of the effects of the Jesuits taken in great detail when they were expelled from the island. By order of the Navy Department, the extant records supposed to be of value have been shipped to Washington. They are comprised in a single case of much mutilated material. Accompanying it is a statement from the Governor of the Island, that "these records comprise everything here that could be saved, white ants having utterly destroyed the bulk of all old records." No such action has yet been taken with reference to the manuscript records in the Philippines, although considerations very similar would seem to apply to these—namely, that they are in peril from damp and from insects, and that, even with intelligent custodianship, if that can be afforded at Manila, they are remote from the centre where historical research is to be carried on, and from the other material indispensable to the study of colonial administration in a comparative way.

Of earlier acquisition are the Spanish and Mexican archives, which came to the Government with the cession of New Mexico and of California. The former were left at Santa Fé in the custody of the Territorial authorities; the latter have been and are now in the custody of the Government land office at San Francisco. Those at Santa Fé have been, during the past half century, victims of shocking neglect and maltreatment; some of them have been deliberately burned, others used as waste or wrapping paper, others freely purloined to serve the interest of individuals in the

prosecution of private claims. All have suffered from damp, from heat and from the ravages of insects. The remnant has been for some years in the technical custody of the Territorial librarian, in the actual keeping of the Secretary of State for the Territory. Of what it consists, how far of documents important to history, can be ascertained only by an examination by experts, which the Territorial authorities were in no position to undertake. The entire collection has now been brought to the Library of Congress, where this examination can be made and the results, if deemed of sufficient value, edited and published in indexes, calendars and abstracts, and where the repairs necessary to the preservation and use of the manuscripts can be arranged for.

A proposal to bring to Washington, for a like purpose, the archives at San Francisco met with a protest from resident societies and individuals in California, who, conceding the title to the documents and the authority over them to rest with the Federal Government, regard their present location as sufficiently safe, and their utility to investigators on the Pacific slope of greater concern than their possible utility to investigators at large.

In the course of the past fiscal year it was learned that Congress had authorized certain custom-houses* to destroy such of their records as were no longer necessary to the administration of the respective offices. Through the courtesy of the Secretary of the Treasury, a representative of the Library of Congress was permitted to make an examination of some of this material, in order to determine whether a part could not judiciously be preserved in the Library as a record of forms used in the past in conducting custom-house operations, and as matter indirectly throwing light upon the commercial methods employed in the earlier history of the nation. Much material of this description was found, and under the order of the Treasury Department it has been transferred to the Library.

In 1827, Edward Everett proposed that Congress should secure and deposit in the Library of Congress copies of all papers in the archives of Great Britain relating to American affairs. He was concerned that the student of our history and institutions should

* They were seventeen in number, and included ports so important as Boston, Salem, New York and Charleston. At New York alone, the records selected for destruction aggregated 200 tons, and dated back to 1790. They were sold as junk at so much per pound.

have to go abroad for the most important of his sources. Four generations have passed, and the student of to-day has still to go abroad for them. He has, indeed, the considerable number of documents reprinted or abstracted from the Record Office by Brodhead in New York, by the Pennsylvania History Society, or by other State authorities, societies or institutions — such as the Loyalist Papers in the New York Public Library, complementing certain originals in the Library of Congress. For the Revolutionary period, he has the excellent facsimiles published by Mr. Stevens. But the larger portion still requires a trip to London. Of the huge and indeterminate mass on the Continent he has as yet not even a precise description. For those in London, such a description and guide is now in prospect: it is at once to be undertaken under a grant from the Carnegie Institution, which is the third beneficent service of this Institution to historical research. One may hope that it will be followed by endeavors to secure accurate information as to what of importance exists at Paris, Versailles, Madrid, Seville, Simancas, Rome and other Continental centres. Such information will be in itself an invaluable aid to research, will promote many a useful investigation and preclude many a fruitless one; and it will doubtless result in the project which is of first concern to historical study in this country to-day, as it was in Mr. Everett's day: the acquisition of copies of numerous documents of which the originals must remain abroad, and the deposit of these at Washington, where they may be made accessible to investigators. Such copies, transcripts or facsimiles will certainly be made; perhaps they will be made by the National Library and the Carnegie Institution in cooperation, as has been proposed by the authorities of the Library. They can be made effectively, however, only after a precise statement by experts as to what exists, and only under a definite plan of procedure which also shall be based upon the judgment of experts.

Meantime, the Library of Congress has not ignored opportunities nearer at hand. It brought to its new building manuscript material that was of first importance, even though the material touched but fragments of our history. During the past six years, it has acquired certain considerable collections: the Preble papers, and the diary and letter-books of Robert Morris already mentioned; the papers of Salmon P. Chase—22 bound volumes and 6,300 letters, covering the period from 1824 to 1873; correspond-

ence of Daniel Webster, which comprises some 2,500 letters to and from him; letter-books and log-books of Commodores Barry and Porter; the Ellis papers—278 bound volumes and over 56,000 individual pieces, the complete office files of a great mercantile house at Richmond, Virginia, importers and exporters during the entire first half of the nineteenth century, invaluable to a student of economic history; and a multitude of non-related items.

It received, last spring, the noble gift of the Andrew Jackson papers, long in the possession of the family of Montgomery Blair. Within the past four months, it acquired by purchase the papers of President Polk, a collection which, among nearly 10,000 items, includes a multitude of political letters as yet unpublished; and still more recently it has had the gift from Mrs. Smith I. Van Buren, of the papers of President Van Buren. With the Washington, Madison, Jefferson and Monroe papers from the State Department, it will thus have advanced far towards a Presidential series. This transfer from the Department of State brings to it, indeed, nearly a thousand volumes which have constituted the most eminent manuscript material in the possession of our Government,—and a considerable section of which—the 307 volumes of the papers of the Continental Congress—has scarcely been explored.

We have, then, to-day various agencies cooperating with each other to bring about conditions more favorable to historical research in this country: A national association of historians, which influences local authorities to investigate the original sources in their possession, to safeguard them and to exploit them—which correlates the work of these local authorities, societies and institutions and supplements it by indexing, calendaring and editing; the Carnegie Institution, creating and maintaining an expert service for the investigation of sources and for guidance in their use; and the federal Government, which, as an efficient and generous publisher, has for years, without charge, put into print the reports of the Historical Association, its proceedings, its discussions and the material accumulated by its two Commissions, and which, through the National Library, desires to make fully and freely available, under expert conduct, the material for history in its possession, and to affiliate itself with every effort to bring within reach of the student of our history the other manuscript sources indispensable to his work.

HERBERT PUTNAM.

THE COMING OF THE RUSSIAN SHIPS IN 1863.

BY GENERAL RUSH C. HAWKINS.

THE true and complete history of the appearance of the Russian squadron upon our coast in the summer of 1863 has not, to my knowledge, been printed or in any other way made public; and I doubt if in Russia, outside the Imperial family, the real facts in relation to its coming were ever known to more than three or four of the highest Cabinet officials.

In the spring of 1862, the forces of England and Spain which had joined with those of France in a move against Mexico for a certain purpose, had completed their part of the object for which the expedition was organized, and evacuated Vera Cruz. The French forces, acting under orders from the Emperor Napoleon, remained; and, in April of that year, France declared war against Juarez and the forces under his command.

This appeared to have been a new move not originally contemplated—possibly, in a measure, it might have been; but the real, the inside, the unwritten history of the French attempt to conquer Mexico, for the purpose of adding it to the list of Imperialisms, has never been clearly understood. The first suggestion for this attempt came from an American woman who was born in one of the slave-holding States, an ardent Roman Catholic, the wife of a French official of some little note. The husband became an advocate of the wife's suggestion; and both were sustained, but not for reasons of state, by a high official who was very near to the Emperor. The latter was urged and yielded; and hence the attempt to establish upon our border an Imperialism to be dominated by a combination of Rome and the Quai d'Orsay.

There is another history of that event; but this, the basic item, has remained one of the best-kept political secrets of the last century. All of the most important papers that related to it were

taken by the Emperor Napoleon from a certain desk in a private residence where they were deposited with others of great political and family importance, read one by one with anxious care, and then destroyed. This occurred only a short time before the death of his favorite adviser, who had urged him on to the beginning of his downfall.

The scheme to subjugate a nation did not work itself out as easily as had been anticipated; and the summer of 1863 found the Mexicans as determined in their opposition to French intervention as ever. Juarez, Diaz and others had proved themselves able commanders, and the native troops had shown that they were equal to the French in courage and endurance. The discouraging reports from Mexico to the Quai d'Orsay were frequent, and had their influence in giving birth to a new move, designed, if successful, to cripple the Power upon which Mexico, if need arose, could rely to expel the invader from her soil.

It was at this period in the "unfortunate Mexican business," the summer of 1863, that the secret circular, now more or less historic, was concocted, and sent privately by confidential messengers from the Emperor of the French to the heads of two, and possibly more, of the greater European nations. It proposed a meeting of representatives, probably to consider ways and means; but the scheme meant for the South an acknowledgment of belligerent rights, and, perhaps, joint direct interference on the part of the Powers to end our Civil War. Unfortunately for the success of this scheme, the European nations addressed had neither direct interest in our internecine war, nor were they in a receptive condition. Prussia was indifferent, and only regarded our contest from a strictly military point of view; Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, and other Italian statesmen were busy inventing plans for the coming national unification; Austria was completely indifferent; and, although the nobility and the majority of the wealthy classes of England were against the North, the "plain people" who composed the bulk of the nation were on the Union side. The Queen, also, was against any interference whatever. These conditions, however, were not known to Czar Alexander II., who, as soon as he had read the communication, discovered what he believed to be its real intent and the momentous consequences designed. But he kept his own counsel and sent for Prince Gortchakoff, his Prime Minister, who was then absent from St. Petersburg.

Gortchakoff returned within two or three days after the summons had been sent, and the whole matter of the reply to the confidential circular was decided upon in one brief consultation and in accordance with the previous intent of the Czar, who then dictated or wrote the answer, which was about to this effect: Russia cannot become a party to any combination with other Powers for the purpose of interfering in the affairs of a friendly nation engaged in a war to maintain its territorial integrity; and, in the event of interference by other Powers, Russia reserves the right to take independent action.

Within six weeks after the Czar had replied to the French Emperor's proposal, Russian ships commenced to appear off our coasts. This incident produced a marked effect upon European opinion. It was construed into a possible warning that any attempt, by outside interference, to embarrass the action of the North would be confronted with active opposition on the part of Russia. Our people appreciated the exceptional value of this gracious act of disinterested friendship, and the relation between the two nations became more cordial than ever.

At a convenient season not long after the close of our war, a fleet composed of some of our finest vessels, officered and manned by naval veterans who had distinguished themselves in active service, and commanded by Gustavus V. Fox, who had made an exceptionally efficient record as the assistant Secretary of the Navy during the whole period of President Lincoln's administration, was fitted out for the purpose of being sent to Russia as an expression of our gratitude for what that nation had done for us at a time when we were in need of friendly recognition, and also to convey to the Czar our congratulations on his escape from assassination.

Upon its arrival at St. Petersburg, it received a most cordial welcome from all classes of the Russian people. Royal receptions were given, and everywhere the most distinguished consideration was bestowed upon the officers and men of the fleet; and some of the newspaper correspondents described scenes which proved that vivacious enthusiasm often usurped the place of sober decorum.

In 1871, the Czar decided upon a return visit of courtesy, and his son, the Grand-Duke Alexis, was sent with an appropriate fleet as the bearer of a friendly message of good-will towards the American people. The ships were ordered to proceed to New

York; and, immediately upon their arrival, the Grand Duke was instructed to proceed to Washington for the purpose of paying his respects to the President. The orders of the Czar were carried out, and the attentions bestowed upon the Grand Duke and his entourage by the authorities and the people of New York were of exceptional brilliancy, quantity and quality.

While the Russian fleet was still in American waters, there was an Imperial reception at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. At that function, as usual, were the representatives of foreign nations, the officials of state, and the greater officers of the army and navy, as well as members of the higher Russian nobility. When the American Minister made his appearance, both the Czar and Czarina stepped out of their places, a very unusual deviation from custom, to greet him. The former said to the Minister: "We have frequently heard from our son of the splendor of the reception he has met with at the hands of your noble people; and I want you to express to them how fully we appreciate the warmth of their welcome." The Minister replied: "I shall take great pleasure in communicating your message to the President of the United States." "No!" exclaimed the Czar, with emphatic warmth; "*not* to the President of the United States, but to the *people* of the United States." The Minister then made a movement as if to pass on, when the Czarina detained him long enough to say: "We can never be sufficiently grateful for the great kindness your people have shown towards our favorite son."

And so ended one of the most painful interviews in the history of our official intercourse with a friendly sovereign of another nation. Our minister at St. Petersburg at that particular time happened to be a gentleman distinguished for his genial nature, wit, intelligence, and exceptional charm of personality; and it was well known that he was a favorite with the Czar. The Minister was not ignorant of that fact, and he felt certain that there was not even a color of anything personal to him in the intention of the Czar. But this was not enough. He was anxious to know something of the real cause for such an unusual exhibition of emphatic expression on the part of the Czar, and the condition of his mind was far from satisfactory. The next day he sought for and obtained a personal interview with Prince Gortchakoff, who, without the least hesitation, but confidentially, gave him the entire facts involved.

He first explained the affair of the note from Napoleon and the Czar's response; and was emphatic in making it completely clear that the idea of sending the Russian fleet originated with the Czar, and that the question of sending it was never presented for the usual official consideration.

Immediately after this part of the interview, Prince Gortchakoff took from a private cabinet a package of papers, and selected from it a cable message from the Grand-Duke Alexis to the Czar, giving an account of his visit to the White House, and his reception there, which he described as having been so cold and devoid of cordiality as to make him feel uncomfortable. So sure was he that his visit, which lasted less than fifteen minutes, was a matter of indifference to the President, that, as soon as he could without appearing rude, he made his formal parting salutation and returned to his hotel. The Prince explained that the coolness displayed had dampened the ardor of the youthful Grand Duke, and had not increased his respect for our democratic manners.

The reception of such a report caused great surprise to the Czar, as he had expected a far different greeting for his favorite son who had been sent to America for the sole and express purpose of bearing a friendly message to the head of a nation which he and his ancestors had held in the highest esteem. But when he came to a full realization of the offence against good breeding, his surprise gave way to indignation; and he said in substance: "I cannot understand why, after obeying my instructions to pay his respects to the President of the United States as soon as possible after his arrival, and after our service to the United States in the hour of its greatest need, my son should have met with such a singular reception. Such discourtesy was a poor return for our friendly offices." The Minister said he never before had seen the Czar in a more pronounced state of indignation.

It is difficult to account for the conduct of our President upon this occasion, and still more difficult to invent an excuse for it. In Washington, at the time of this incident, it was well known, in both official and social circles, that the relations between the then head of the State Department and the Russian Minister were so strained, that the intercourse between them was confined to brief official interviews; and, in relation to this condition of affairs, there was an openly circulated rumor to the effect that our government had asked for the recall of the Russian Minister, and that

the Russian Government had requested that he should be permitted to remain at his post until the close of the Grand Duke's visit. This, to an extent, may possibly explain the incident; but in no sense can it be regarded as an excuse for such exceptional conduct on the part of our Chief Executive to the special envoy of the head of a friendly nation. After this unpleasant affair there were other annoyances of lesser magnitude of no particular importance, but sufficient to mar the smoothness of international relations; and our Minister to Russia, who had been made an involuntary party to conditions he could not approve, reluctantly retired from a position where his personal relations had yielded most pleasurable results.

There may have been sealed orders sent to Admiral Lisovsky who sailed with his flag-ship from Cadiz to meet the other vessels which were assembling in our waters. But that they were of any special importance is extremely doubtful; and the belief which appears to have, to an extent, obtained that in the event of necessity there was to be an intervention of force against the acts of other nations can have no foundation in fact. Such an open belligerent alliance with us could not have taken place without an existing *casus belli* against the offending nation with which Russia might have been at peace.

Apropos of the friendly relations that have always existed between two nations which are so completely opposed in form of government, it may not be out of place to recall a conversation which may explain, to an extent, this political paradox.

Back in the fifties of the last century Stephen A. Douglas, then a Senator of the United States, while in St. Petersburg was presented to the Czar and invited by him to attend a review of troops, and while riding together to the field, the conversation was about forms of government. The Senator, no doubt, drew a roseate picture of our perfect political conditions. But, whether he did or not, just before they reached the field to become absorbed in other affairs, the Czar ended the conversation by saying:

"There can be but two forms of government, one an autocracy where one man rules, and the other a democracy where all men rule."

RUSH C. HAWKINS.

RELIGION AND RELIGIONS.

BY THE REV. R. HEBER NEWTON, D.D.

THE tree, starting from a seed, has unity in its source. Growing through trunk and stem and branches and twigs and leaves and fruit, it develops varied forms and functions, as expressions of its life; the life which yet ever remains one in the common sap flowing through every part of the common organism. The whole complex life of the tree strains through this rich variety towards the flower and the fruit, into which every member of the organism distils its essential life; and lo! there is again a oneness.

Religion viewed from the human standpoint, as an expression of man's spiritual life, is his effort for the adjustment of his life with the Cosmic Power; his thought of that Power, his feeling towards It, and his conduct under It. Religion, viewed as the life of the Cosmic Power manifesting itself in the life of man, is God's self-communication to the soul of man; His guidance of man's thought into a knowledge of Himself (theology), His messages to the mind of man (revelation), His stirring of man's feelings into aspiration for the divine life (inspiration), His direction of man's conduct into character (ethics). In either aspect, religion is one in its source, its inner nature, its end and aim; one in the oneness of our human nature, the oneness of the divine nature, the oneness together of these natures of God and man. But, as an expression of the life of man who is himself in a process of growth, and as an expression of the life of God who is amid the processes of self-unfolding, religion must, between the seed and the flower, differentiate itself into the rich variety of forms and functionings which we behold in the manifold religions of earth; differing in its phases with the different stages of man's growth, the different environments of the many lands of earth, the different civilizations of history. Each of these religions, however,

proves itself to a scientific study an expression of some necessary phase of religion; each subserves a use in the evolution of the fruitioning religion of humanity; each will find its permanent value preserved and its transient uses discarded in the attained unity of the flowering soul of man.

There can be no dispute concerning the oneness of the source of religion, viewed either in its human or its divine aspect. My aim is to suggest hints of the essential unity of religion even now underlying all religions, and the ultimate oneness toward which all religions are forth-reaching.

I.

The religions of Christendom resolve themselves into varieties of the one Christian Religion. Between the most uncommon of the sects of the Western world there is found that which Dean Stanley was wont to call our "common Christianity"—the essential Christian elements. This is to be seen alike in the Institutions, the Worship, the Beliefs and the Life of Christendom. But this phase of our subject must be passed, under the necessities of the space limit.

II.

What is true between the different churches of Christianity is true also between Christianity and other religions. Is man one in nature the world over; the human race, despite of all its vast variations, one *genus homo*; the blood coursing in the veins of Asiatics, Europeans, Africans and Americans the same sacred ichor—as by all our scientific research is proving to be the fact? Then is real religion one, wherever, in the differing religions of earth, the soul of man, seeking to adjust itself to its cosmic relationships—to know its cosmic source, to obey its cosmic law, to reach its cosmic goal—looks up to God in hope and trust, looks out to man in love. The religions of men are many: the religion of man is one. Vary as religions may and must under varying environments and heredities, through the varying temperaments of different races and the varying stages of the growth of man; emphasizing, as each must needs do, the peculiar phase of the divine life imaged in these differing human mirrors; marked, as each necessarily is, by the errors which are the shadows of these partial truths, yet are all but variations of the one true religion, the life of God in the soul of man.

So we find that the Institutions and Worships, the Beliefs and the Life which are common to the different Christian churches, are common, also, to the different religions of humanity.

III.

Religion develops the same great *Institutions* in different lands and ages, which the varying religions of man vary indefinitely.

The Church, spelled with a capital C, was an institution of Chaldea, India and Egypt, millenniums ago, as it is of Italy and England and America, to-day. The Buddhist felt towards his "order" much as the Romanist feels towards his church. A sacred ministry, a class of men set apart for the divine offices of religion, would have been found of old in Babylon and Thebes, as it is found now in Rome and London. The Pagan Temple was the Christian Basilica and Cathedral, baptized with another name. The altar stood in the sacred spot of the heathen temple, as it stands in the holy place of the Christian minster. Monasticism developed in the East long before it arose in the West. Monks and nuns and hermits would have been found along the Nile valley ages before Christendom poured its host of sad-souled ascetics up the sacred river, peopling the hills for thousands of miles. Good Father Huc was utterly astonished to find in the Far East tonsured priests bowing before splendid altars, while acolytes swung the fragrant censers by their side. His naïf explanation was, that the devil had counterfeited in advance the mysteries of true religion, in order that the elect might be deceived into perdition. A less heroic solution of the problem finds in these resemblances hints of the oneness of religion, generating the same sacred institutions among different religions.

The natural symbolism of washing had suggested itself to pious souls of many lands, and other religions than Christianity had their own sacred lustrations. The distinctive form of sacred washing which Christianity inherits from the Jewish John had grown into use in widely differing religions, as a rite of initiation into the divine life, the symbol of renunciation of the past, the sign of self-purification, the sacrament of the divine forgiveness of sins. India had its well, recognizing baptism. The penitent, seeking the remission of sin, the cleansing of his soul from evil and the consecration of his life to holier aims, was led down by the Guru into the waters of the sacred river, immersed in its flowing tides,

and was then led up the banks, clothed in white linen, and signed with the sign of the cross. Dean Alford's noble baptismal hymn might have been sung over the confessors of the faith by the Ganges, as by the Thames. Mithraicism had a similar ceremony, as had also the mysteries of Greece and other lands. The Christian Church holds its prized baptism as a trustee for humanity, whose sacred possession it is, the sacrament for the opening of the one spiritual life of the children of the one God in all lands and under all religions.

The Lord's Supper, by general tradition instituted by Jesus himself, was an outgrowth of the Jewish Passover Supper. As it is observed in the two greatest churches of Christendom, it is far from the original institution, the simple memorial meal of Jesus; far, also, from the early Christian rite, the Love-Feast of primitive Christianity. And the difference between the Mass of the Church of Rome and the Eucharist of the Greek Church, on the one hand, and the Love-Feast of primitive Christianity and the memorial meal of Jesus, on the other hand, admeasures the inflowings from the surrounding Pagan environment of early Christianity.

The prototypes of the Christian communion are to be traced in the sacred meals of the secret societies of Paganism, the *collegia* of the Roman Empire and the labor-unions of Greece. The working-man's Brotherhoods of antiquity celebrated a common meal as the central rite of the fraternity, the symbolic expression of the communal life which they sought to educate—a cooperative commonwealth growing round a holy communion.

The ancestry of the Mass is to be found in the Mysteries of Mithraicism and Greece, as well as in the Passover of Judaism; it is the child of Isis, as of Jehovah. The sacred mysteries of different lands, those esoteric ethical and spiritual cults so widely scattered among the religions of antiquity, observed a sacred meal as a symbol of man's communion with God. The outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace whereby man doth partake of the very life of God, and doth nourish his being into holiness by eating of the bread which "cometh down from heaven," by drinking the wine which "maketh glad the heart of man," whose natural symbols are in the wheat and the grape, the choicest fruitings of the indwelling life of nature. Bread and wine were distributed to the

worshippers and eaten and drunk in reverence, with prayer and praise. Curiously, again, the Mass even preserves the ancient Pagan form of the sacred bread—the unleavened wafer still to be seen on the patten upon the altar.

All this was natural and inevitable in the sacramental system of nature; through which a law of correspondence runs, causing every form of life to be a type, a shadow of a higher form of life, making the fundamental function of feeding, whereby life is conserved and increased, a symbol of the functioning of the soul for the maintenance and development of spiritual life, the growth in grace of the spirit of man by assimilating the thoughts of the divine mind, and converting them into character. The Christian Mass is the highest dramatization of the mysteries of the soul—a dramatization rehearsed centuries ago upon the banks of the Euphrates, the Cephissus and the Orontes. (This is the glory, not the shame, of Christianity, proving it the flowering forth of the various religions of antiquity, whose best life strained into it, reappears in it.)

IV.

In *worship* all religions prove themselves akin. The sacred symbolisms through which art ministers to worship meet us in the temples of Paganism as in the churches of Christendom. The circle, the triangle and the trefoil were graven by Pagan chisels on the walls of the sacred buildings reared by religions which thought of themselves only as aliens and foes one to the other. For the unity of God, signed by the circle, and the tri-unity, the oneness in variety, of God, signed by the triangle and the trefoil, were truths known to no one religion alone, shared by all great religions in the same stage of evolution. The cross, which forms the most sacred symbol of our Christian churches, painted above the altar, shining in brass from the altar itself, flashing from the top of the lofty steeple—this same cross would have been found in the temples of well-nigh every religion of the past, as its most sacred symbol. Even the sacred buildings themselves were often constructed on the cruciform plan. The sleeping-places of the dead were hallowed by the same sign which consecrates our “acres of God”; and stone and brass crosses cast their shadows over the graves of Pagans, as of Christians. The cross was to those heathen, as to us Christians, the sacred sign of life; of the life of man in the human body; of the life of man escaping

from the body and rising through death into immortality; of human life accepting the law of sacrifice under which the superior souls of earth devote themselves to the saving of their fellows; of the life of God Himself, in which all these mysteries of our human life find their source and spring, their ground and aim. It was the symbol of the cosmic mystery which the seer beheld, when he saw "in the midst of the throne as it were a lamb slain from the foundation of the world"; the cosmic mystery which the Pagan seers beheld when they fashioned that strangest symbol of antiquity, found in many a land, within many a religion—a crucified Saviour hanging in the skies; the truth now forever sacred to man, since the supreme Son of Man died upon the cross of Cavalry, embodying once for all the cosmic mystery in the human life divine.

If we turn to the inmost heart of worship, it is to find that, as in religious symbolism, so in the essential life of the soul, under the many religions of men there is one religion of man. Every religion, as it has grown, has grown out of rite into reverence, out of ceremony into character, out of the prescribed performances of priestly piety into the prayer and praise which are the very soul of true worship. Each may have begun in the rituals of superstitious fear, which are recorded alike in the Levitical legislation, the institutions of Manu, and the ceremonial codes of Chaldea; but all have evolved into the pure passion of the soul, forever sacred to man, in the litanies of Accadia, the psalms of the Old Testament, the metrical prayers of the Vedas, the lofty aspirations of the Upanishads, the devout worship of the hymn of Cleanthes and the calm meditations of Marcus Aurelius. Prayer and praise form the efflorescence of Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and the many religions of Egypt, as of Christianity. When the Mohammedan worships, he kneels upon his mat and prays, as does the Christian. Different as the outer forms of human prayers may be, their inner substance is one, the desire for the knowledge of God, the hunger for the life of God, the longing for the forgiveness of sins and peace with God, the realization of the oneness of man with his source and spring. To-day, when we would enkindle our souls in public worship, we Christians open the ancient Jewish psalter, and are fain to pray and praise in the words written centuries ago under the shadows of the temple of Zion, or by the waters of Babylon. And when we

Christians would retire into the sacred place of our being, and, shutting the door of the senses, would be alone with God, how often do we find the priest for this silent worship in some ancient heathen, whose soul-communings are immortalized in the poem or the prayer which make our anthologies of religion so precious to us—the companion of our closet proving not merely the Christian Augustine and à Kempis, but the Pagan Epictetus and Plato.

V.

On the surface of the subject, the *beliefs* of men seem bewilderingly manifold, hopelessly discordant. How many the faiths for which religions have fought! How contradictory religious beliefs one of another! What possible ground of unity can be found for religions as dissimilar as Hinduism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and the various cults of Egypt, of Greece and of Rome? Is not the *raison d'être* of each great religion, in a science of comparative religion, to be found in the affirmation of some truth or truths not held by other systems? Must not each great religion, therefore, be dissonant with all other great religions; the more positive its affirmation, the more strident its discord in the Babel voices of the soul? Does, then, the flute or the violin or the clarionet merely make a discord in the cacophany of the orchestra? Does not the master of music blend these variant cries of the instruments into a symphony? "The symphony of religions," Cudworth's great word long prior to our own Higginson, is a phrase as scientifically true as it is poetically fine. As the golden tides of the music of the soul beat around the throne of God, all the discords of religions harmonize in the concord of religion, each truth for which men have struggled finding its complement in some other truth against which they have struggled, God thus fulfilling Himself in many ways.

But there is a unity deeper than the oneness of harmony in the variant voices of the soul. All great religions pass through one general course of evolution. In the same stages of development, all alike will bring forth, as the same institutions and worships, so also the same beliefs. Arrange these different religions synchronously, in respect to their evolution, and the same ideas will be found in all, more or less modified. As they grow, they grow together; over all differences of environment and heredity, the forces of the common life of man asserting the oneness which

exists under black skins and yellow, red skins and white. In their higher reaches they strain towards each other. The flowering of all beliefs is in one faith—all religions seeding down one religion. So, beneath the variant and discordant beliefs of the present the germs of the future universal religion can even now be traced. The Cambridge School of Platonists divined this long ago; but how could their fine voices make themselves heard against the raucous cries of the age of Cromwell and Laud? A generation or more before our day, a few widely read, but not scholarly trained, thinkers caught sight of this same vision, and laboriously spread the unwelcome tokens of it before an unsympathetic age; earning for themselves the ill odor which still clings to the names of Godfrey and Higgins and their ilk. In our own day, a talented and conservative Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a devoted High-Churchman and an open-minded student, through his researches in sacred symbolism gained glimpses of this truth, which so fascinated him that he pursued the clue found unwittingly in his hands, until he laid before his Church the results of his studies in the noble volume entitled "*Monumental Religion*." In this epoch-marking work, Dr. Lundy, accepting the Apostles' Creed as the norm and type of all creeds, traced, clause by clause, the parallelisms which he had discovered in other religions; showing that every article in the creed found its counterpart in the various systems of Paganism. As a consequence, this creed appeared, in a sense utterly dwarfing the timid conceptions of the traditional churchman, a Catholic Creed, a form of faith confessed by men of all lands and ages—the symbol of Universal Religion. Dr. Lundy might have meant only to exalt the creed of Christendom; he succeeded in revealing the creed of Humanity.

VI.

The supreme religious functioning resumes the experience of every lower activity, and in the *life* which is the end and aim of institutions and worships and beliefs, we see again that, though there are many religions, there is one religion.

As each great religion evolves, it evolves towards character and conduct, confessing that its heart's blood is ethical, that it is in order to grow a soul. In its lower and rudimentary forms it may anywhere be unmoral, or even immoral; expressing thus the immature development of human nature in the land and age,

manifesting the degeneracy back into which life ever tends to slip, as the propulsive forces of evolution for a period fail; but, in its highest reaches, it is everywhere a movement towards the awed recognition of God as the Power Making for Righteousness, and towards the attainment of righteousness as the true communion of man with God. Every religion, in growing, becomes ethical and spiritual. All religions are at one in the ideals before them, in the goal towards which they strive. The ethical and spiritual life, which is the common fruitioning of all religions, is not one thing in one religion and another thing in another religion. There is no real discord between the ethics of Buddhism and Confucianism and the religions of Greece and Rome, no essential difference between the spirituality of the Hindu and Persian and the Egyptian, save as each naturally shows the different coloring of race and environment upon the face of the same soul. The ethical and spiritual life of all these varieties of Paganism is one and the same ethical and spiritual life which tides the soul of the Christian.

The ideals of character vary in varying lands, but only as the refractions of the same light falling in different angles of the same prism will vary. It is one and the same light of life through all the variations of the spectrum. The human ideals are one everywhere. Purity and Justice and Truth and Temperance and Charity—these need no translation from the speech of the Pagan to the tongue of the Christian. There is no Hindu purity, no Buddhist renunciation, no Chinese temperance, no Grecian justice, no Persian truthfulness. The flora and fauna of the human soul are one wherever humanity is found. Every ethical force correlates into every other ethical force. Goodness knows no native soil. Virtue is at home in every land. The Ten Commandments form the law of Egypt and of Persia as of Christendom. The Golden Rule proves the rule of Hindu and Chinaman, as of the Christian. It waited not for Jesus to reveal it. The spirit of the Christ had already revealed it through Jewish Hillel and Chinese Confucius, and great spirits of well-nigh every land. The Beatitudes exigently call upon the Buddhist as upon the Christian, "*Sursum corda.*" Saints are of blood kin the world over.

There is nothing alien to the truly devout Christian in the devoutness of the Hindu Guru, or of the yellow-robed saint of

Japan or of the mystic worshipper among the Iranian mountains. When the soul of man fronts the Infinite and Eternal Spirit, beneath the bo tree of India or amid the rugged fastnesses of Thibet or in the cloisters of the Christian abbey, it is one and the same God who is seen. Wherever we overhear the communings of a soul with God, we hear in our own tongue. In the presence of the man of the spirit, be his name what it may, we know that he is of our family and household of God. Is it anything to us that Plotinus just missed being a Christian, as we hearken to this his meditation?

"So let the soul that is not unworthy of that Vision contemplate the Great Soul; freed from deceit and witchery and collected into calm. Calmed be the body for her in that hour, and the tumult of the flesh; ay, all that is about her calm; calm be the earth, the sea, the air, and let Heaven itself be still. Then let her feel how into that silent Heaven the Great Soul floweth in. . . . And so may man's soul be sure of Vision, when suddenly she is filled with light; for this light is from Him, and is He; and then surely shall we know His presence, when, like a god of old time, He enters into the house of one that calleth Him and maketh it full of light. And how may this thing be for us? Let all else go."

VII.

One religion—many religions. One source and spring of real religion everywhere, in all ages, though many courses through which it flows; taking on different flavors and colors from different soils, and becoming many different religions; now poisoning itself in the miasmatic marshes of superstitious ignorance, now becoming foul and fetid from the discharge into it of the *cloaca* through which man's brutal lusts and evil passions and cruel hatreds empty themselves; again purifying itself under the free winds of heaven and beneath the rays of that Sun of Righteousness ever rising over earth "with healing in its wings."

One inner essence, therefore, within all the bewilderingly variant forms which religion assumes, in different lands and in different times; as man faces one and the same universe, finds one and the same problems to solve, hears within him one and the same mystic voice of the soul, sees behind him one and the same origin, visions before him one and the same destiny, discerns over him one and the same law of life, recognizes in himself one and the same order of evolution for the spiritual life of man everywhere, through which it mounts by one and the same series

of stages, under all variations of race, so that the same institutions, worships, beliefs and life appear in different religions at the same period of development.

One glorious burgeoning and blossoming of religion in all climes, one ideal of human life divine, rising above the souls of all the loftily striving sons of men of every blood, one secret of cosmic consciousness opening within the spirits of the wise and the good in all countries, one life of fellowship with man and communion with God as the end and aim of religion throughout the ages; in whose blessedness all earnest and devout souls, when illumined, do recognize each other as the children together of the All Father.

This is the epiphany, or manifestation of God in man, which is now rising over our earth; that earth on which, through the centuries, men have differed from each other, not so much in their politics or economics as in their religions; have fought each other, not so bitterly for the possession of lands and the control of trade, as for the maintenance of a monopoly of religion; being held apart in mutual animosities, persecutions and wars by the very thing which should have been their bond of peace. Thank God for the vision of our day, in which, while we still stand apart in our different religions, as befits our different heredities and environments, our varying traditions and temperaments, we know that, under these religions many, there lives one religion—the life of God in the soul of man.

In the recognition of this revelation of our age—the revelation coming to us at the hands of the suspected angels whom we call Science, Comparative Religion, the Higher Criticism and a host of other spirits of bad repute in the heaven of the churches—in the recognition of this revelation, we become conscious of the shame and sin of the divisions which break up Christendom into sects and denominations, not as the natural groupings of spiritual affinities, freely interchanging and cooperating to mutual advantage, but as the unnaturally attempted monopolizations of the truth and the life which are the common heritage of the children of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the light of this truth, we see the folly and the wickedness of the standing apart from one another which emphasizes the minor matters on which we differ, rather than the essential matters on which we are at one; which makes the note of a standing or a falling church pos-

session of the accidents rather than of the substance of real religion, the body, not the soul, of the child of God; which places on the green of our New England villages a row of competing churches, each one half-starved, with a poorly paid parson and a poorly equipped plant, and which turns the energies of the struggling churches of our great cities into all sorts of wretched devices for making both ends meet, and for filling the empty places in the needlessly duplicated buildings, mechanicalizing, materializing and mammonizing the religion ostensibly served; which leaves the business world to learn the secret of success in concentration and cooperation, reserving for the supreme institution of humanity—the Church—to blunder along in the obsolete methods of an outworn civilization, a survival of competition in the age of the trust. The first moral of the truth that religions are many while religion is one should set our Christian churches to pray that prayer of their dying master—"that they all may be one"; to pray it as men who can themselves bring down the answer from God, whenever they will to know their oneness in Him and to live it forth.

In the recognition of the truth that there are many religions but one religion, we open our eyes to the folly and the crime of the present attitude of Christendom to the other great religions of earth; the folly and the crime which effectually neutralize the heroic efforts of our foreign missionary work. The East India treaty of 1813 contained the following paragraph, known as "The Missionaries' Charter." It reads thus:

"Whereas it is the duty of this country (England) to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions, and such measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge and of religion and moral improvement."

The "*introduction of religion*"! There had been, then, no religion in the land which had produced little else but religion! There were, then, no plants of the Heavenly Father's planting in the soil of India, no life of God in the soul of the Hindu, no feeling after God by his children in Bengal and the Punjab, no graces of the spirit grown in the lives of the children of Madras and Bombay, no virtues blossoming forth in the saints meditating by the shores of the Indus and the Jumna!

We still go to India to introduce religion, and then wonder that we get no warmer welcome and achieve no greater results. Could we but go thither to recognize the reality of the religion growing there in such rank fertility; to say after Paul—"Ye men of Benares, we perceive that in all things ye are very religious"; to confess the truths held and the life lived there as of God; humbly to learn from the seers of India what they have to teach us, and then, finding them thus ready to receive from us what we have to teach them, to bring to them the story of the Divine Man whose truth and life we hold in trust for the world, bidding them find in Him what they need of truth, what they lack of life—how different our foreign missionary work would be! The first step to a successful foreign missionary work is honestly to face the truth of the topic now before us, religion and religions—one religion under many religions.

In Stanford University last winter, the president showed me a letter lately received from a young minister who had been engaged for two or three years in foreign missionary work in the East. It was a frank and manly letter, breathing throughout the surprise and consternation of an honest soul who had gone upon his work believing that Christianity held a monopoly of true religion, and that he was to displace the false religions of the East by introducing religion; an honest soul who, in the face of the real religiousness of India, of the truths held there and the life lived there, had awakened with a start to realize that "in every land he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him"; that "that was the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world"; and that we who have seen the "great sheet let down from heaven are thenceforth to call nothing common or unclean."

He was coming back, so he wrote, to take up the study of Sanskrit, that he might master the sources of Hinduism at first hand, and thus prepare himself, humbly and wisely, to go back with a living message to the living children of the living God.

R. HEBER NEWTON.

IS THE NEW IMMIGRATION DANGEROUS TO THE COUNTRY?

BY O. P. AUSTIN, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF STATISTICS IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Is our country in serious danger from the flood of immigration which is pouring into it at the present time?

This is a question which should be seriously considered.

Immigrants are now coming into the country at a more rapid rate than at any other time in its history. During the first quarter of the last century, the immigration averaged about 12,000 a year. During the second quarter of the century, it averaged annually about 100,000. In the years of the third quarter of the century, it averaged about 260,000, and in those of the last quarter of the century it averaged about 400,000.

During the three years of the new century, which have made a record, the yearly average was 665,000. Here are the figures, stated in round terms:

Period.	Number of Immigrants.	Annual Average.
1800 to 1825.....	300,000	8,000
1825 to 1850.....	2,500,000	100,000
1850 to 1875.....	6,500,000	260,000
1875 to 1900.....	10,000,000	400,000
1900 to 1903.....	2,000,000	665,000

The above figures are, of course, approximate, for it would not be expected that they would fall in exact millions or half-millions in each quarter of the century; but they are sufficiently accurate to serve for this general study. For the benefit, however, of those who desire a more accurate statement, the following table gives the exact figures, by decades, from 1820, the earliest year in which any record of the immigration was kept, also an estimate for the period from 1789 to 1820.

Immigration into the United States by Decennial Periods, 1821 to 1900, and from 1901 to 1903.

Period.	Number.	Annual Average.
1789 to 1820 (estimated)	250,000	12,000
1821 to 1830 (decade)	143,439	14,343
1831 to 1840 "	599,125	59,912
1841 to 1850 "	1,713,251	171,325
1851 to 1860 "	2,598,214	259,821
1861 to 1870 "	2,314,824	231,482
1871 to 1880 "	2,812,191	281,219
1881 to 1890 "	5,246,613	524,661
1891 to 1900 "	3,844,420	384,442
1901 to 1903 (three years)	1,993,707	664,569

This gives a grand total of 21,515,784. To this there must be added the number who have come from Canada since 1885, for there has been no attempt to make a record of the immigration from Canada since that date, owing to the difficulty of making a satisfactory record of the real immigrants among the large number of people crossing and recrossing between the United States and Canada. The fact, however, that the last Census showed 1,183,000 persons of Canadian birth in the United States in 1900, justifies the conclusion that the number coming into this country from Canada is large, and has probably amounted to half a million since 1885. This would, therefore, justify the general statement that the total number of immigrants who have come into the United States since the beginning of the last century is, in round terms, 22,000,000.

The Census reports show that the number of persons of foreign birth residing in the United States in 1900 was 10,341,276. Thus, it appears that practically one-half of the 22,000,000 immigrants who have come into the United States since the beginning of the last century are still residents, and in most cases citizens of the country. They formed, in 1900, 13.6 per cent. of the population. They formed in many States more than 33 per cent. of the total population. The Census shows a total increase of population from all sources, from 1890 to 1900, of 13,681,137; while the total number of persons coming into the country as immigrants during that period was 3,844,420, exclusive of those from Canada, or probably 4,000,000 in round numbers.

In a study of this question, it is perhaps not improper to consider also the native-born persons of foreign parentage. If any share of the persons of foreign birth coming into the United States bring with them sentiments and customs of a dangerous

or otherwise objectionable character, they are likely to be transmitted, in a greater or less degree, to their children, who naturally and necessarily absorb, in early life, at least, the sentiments and customs of their parents, and are likely to be influenced by them in their habits of life after reaching maturity. When we consider, from this standpoint, the question of the effect of the large foreign-born population upon our institutions and customs, the problem becomes even more serious. The last Census shows that, in 1900, there were in the United States 15,687,322 persons born in this country of foreign-born parents. Adding to this the 10,341,276 persons of foreign birth, it gives a total of over 26,000,000 persons of foreign parentage in the United States, not including any of its island possessions or Alaska. This means that more than one-third of the entire population of the United States—or, to be more exact, 34 per cent.—is of foreign parentage. To put it in a single sentence, 13 1-3 per cent. of the entire population is of foreign birth and 34 per cent. of foreign parentage. In no less than fifteen States, persons of foreign parentage (including those born abroad and those born in the United States of foreign parents) formed more than one-half of the population, and in seven States more than 60 per cent. of the total. In practically all the great cities of the country, except those of the South, the persons of foreign parentage form more than one-half of the total, and in each of the great cities of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee they form more than 75 per cent. of the total population, and thus may easily and absolutely control in law-making and administration if they choose to act in concert.

In attempting to consider the effect of this great mass of foreign people and sentiment upon our population and institutions, it is proper to consider the nationalities of those coming to the United States and of those now forming this large part of its population. During the time in which the people of northern Europe formed the bulk of the immigration, there was a general feeling that immigration was advantageous. They were readily assimilated into our population, they quickly adopted our customs and sentiments, they came intending to make this country their permanent home, and their energies were devoted to the establishment of homes and the retention in the United States of whatever they were able to accumulate in the shape of finances.

With the later years, the source of the stream has somewhat changed, and with this change has come a change in the character of the stream itself. The question which we naturally desire seriously to consider is, whether the change is such as to impair the value of the immigration to the country.

Of the 22,000,000 people who have come into the United States for the purpose of making this country their home, speaking in round terms, 5,000,000 have come from Germany, 4,000,000 from Ireland, 2,750,000 from England, 2,000,000 from Canada, and about 1,500,000 each from Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Norway and Sweden. These eight nationalities contribute 20,000,000 of the 22,000,000 who have come into the country since 1800. Of this total of 22,000,000 people, 16,000,000 have come from Germany, Ireland, Scotland, England, Norway and Sweden, France, and Canada; and 4,500,000 have come from Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia. This does not on its face look as though the proportion of the immigrants from Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia was alarmingly large. But it is when we examine the record of recent years that we find the evidence of great increase in arrivals from the last-named countries. The total number of arrivals from these countries from 1820 to the close of 1895 was 2,270,000, and the total number from the close of 1895 to the close of the fiscal year, 1903, was 2,312,000. On the other hand, the total number of arrivals from Germany, Ireland, England, Norway and Sweden, and Canada prior to the end of 1895 was a little over 14,000,000, and since that date a little over 1,000,000. Thus the number of arrivals from Italy, Russia, and Austria-Hungary since 1895 is equal to all the arrivals from those countries prior to that date; while in the case of Germany, England, Ireland, Norway and Sweden, and Canada, the number since 1895 is but about one-fourteenth of the number from those countries prior to that date. Prior to the close of 1895, the total number of arrivals from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary formed but 12½ per cent. of the grand total of arrivals; since that date the arrivals from those three countries have formed over 60 per cent. of the total. The following tables show the number of arrivals from each of the eight principal countries from which our immigration is drawn, prior to the close of the fiscal year 1895, and from that date to the close of the fiscal year 1903, and the average per year for each

decade from 1820 to 1903, and gives an opportunity to note the relative changes in recent years.

Immigrants from Principal Countries, 1820-1895 and 1895-1903.

Countries.	Total from 1820 to June 30, 1895.	Total from June 30, 1895, to June 30, 1903.	Total from 1820 to 1903.
Germany	4,940,538	197,553	5,138,091
Ireland	3,718,356	256,213	3,974,569
England	2,647,230	118,946	2,766,176
Canada	1,800,000	200,000	2,000,000
Norway and Sweden...	1,136,875	268,545	1,405,420
Italy	680,598	908,651	1,589,249
Austria-Hungary	716,265	806,659	1,522,924
Russia and Poland....	873,887	597,137	1,471,024

Annual Immigration by Decades, 1820-1900 and 1901-1903.

Years.	Germany.	Ireland.	England.	Norway and Sweden.	Russia and Poland.	Austria-Hungary.	Italy.
1821-30	676	5,072	2,216	9	9	—	40
1831-40	15,245	20,738	7,314	120	64	—	225
1841-50	43,462	78,071	26,333	1,390	65	—	187
1851-60	95,166	91,412	38,564	2,093	162	—	923
1861-70	78,746	43,577	56,812	10,929	453	780	1,172
1871-80	71,818	43,687	46,047	21,124	5,225	7,296	5,576
1881-90	145,297	65,482	65,748	56,836	26,508	35,372	30,730
1891-1900 ..	54,392	40,349	28,231	32,593	58,686	59,704	65,566
1901-03	30,013	31,666	14,003	51,482	109,566	163,767	181,664

But is all this as serious as we are accustomed to consider it? Is the foreign population growing more rapidly than our power to assimilate it? Is the element of the immigration which is so rapidly increasing really so dangerous a factor in our civilization as we are accustomed to think? Is it filling our jails and almshouses as rapidly as we hear that glibly talked of? Does its objectionable character offset its advantages as a ready and willing labor-supply in this rapidly developing country, where labor is so necessary a factor of our development and prosperity? These are questions which we should carefully consider, before condemning this latest feature of our immigration and demanding that the gates be closed. Perhaps they ought to be more carefully guarded, to prevent the admission of the more objectionable elements of these masses of recent arrivals; but the whole question of the relation of these people to our industries, and to the development of crime and dependency, ought to be studied carefully before a wholesale condemnation of any class or nationality is made.

It is difficult to measure the relation of the recent arrivals to

crime and dependency, because the figures of the Census of 1900 on this subject are not yet published. But those of 1890 are available; and, while the number of persons of these classes in the United States at that time was not so great as at present, they were apparently sufficient to determine pretty well what their habits are with reference to crime and dependency. In 1890, there were in the United States 182,614 Russians, 182,342 Italians, 147,416 Poles, 123,185 Austrians, and 62,409 Hungarians, besides large numbers of other classes from northern Europe, whom we now look upon as welcome immigrants, and as much less liable to become a burden or an unsatisfactory element of our population. With more than half a million of this so-called "objectionable class" in the country in 1890, and a thorough analysis of their relation to crime and dependency supplied by the Census of that year, we may form some idea as to whether we are justified in the alarm which is being felt in regard to the large increase in its numbers during recent years.

As has been already stated, the eight groups of people who form the bulk of our immigration are from Germany, Ireland, England, Canada, Norway and Sweden, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Russia. The immigrants from the first five named are generally looked upon as valuable accessions to our population. Let us, then, compare the relation to crime and dependency of what has been termed the "objectionable class"—the Italians, Russians, and Austro-Hungarians—with that of these other more welcome classes from northern Europe. The Census of 1890 presents a table showing the number of persons in each million who were in that year prisoners, juvenile offenders, paupers and inmates of benevolent institutions. A study of this table develops the fact that each million of the various nationalities contributed to these four classes as follows: Poles, 4,580; Austrians, 4,805; Russians, 5,202; Germans, 5,662; Hungarians, 6,792; English, 7,160; Scotch, 7,288; Italians, 9,877; French, 10,864; Irish, 16,624.

It is not claimed that this answers the assertion that the foreign-born population supplies a larger percentage of the dependent and criminal class than does the native population. On the contrary, the record of the Census of 1890 shows that 7,718 out of each million of foreign-born whites were inmates of these four classes of institutions, and only 3,708 in each million of na-

tive whites. The same Census also shows that 3,843 out of each million of foreign birth were insane, and only 1,329 out of each million of native-born persons. But it does seem to throw some doubt upon the oft-repeated assertion that the immigrants from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary are more likely to become dependent or criminal than other immigrants.

It is not assumed that there is serious objection, on the part of any considerable part of the population of the United States, to the class of immigrants who formed the bulk of the arrivals in earlier years. The sturdy, peace-loving people from the north of Europe have formed, and are continuing to form, a valuable addition to our population, in the agricultural sections, in the mining regions, in manufacturing, in the construction of great public works where willing labor is required in great numbers, and in the cities where workmen are needed. It is not necessary to come to the defence of this class of immigration, which has proved so valuable in developing our great country, which could not have been developed with any such rapidity and success without the aid of the immigrants who have come to our assistance. It is to determine whether the class from southern Europe and Russia, which is now coming in such large numbers as to change the character of the entire stream, is of a sufficiently different character to make it advisable to establish barriers which may at least check its flow in our direction. Certainly, the figures just quoted, as to the number per million of the various groups which become part of the criminal or dependent class, do not indicate that the people of southern Europe or Russia have so far proved more objectionable in this particular than others from abroad. On the contrary, a smaller number per million of these particular classes falls into the dependent and criminal group than of those who are so cordially welcomed.

Now let us consider the question of education. It is true that those coming to the United States, especially those from southern Europe and Russia, are in too many cases deficient in education. But this has been, to a great extent, the case with our immigration for many years, and we have not felt any serious effect from it, because of the fact that most of the immigrants quickly obtained a sufficient education to enable them to conform to the customs of the country, and because of the further fact that their own deficiencies in this particular seem to have stimulated them to

greater efforts on behalf of their children than would have been the case under other circumstances. Certainly it is a fact, for some reason, that the children of foreign-born citizens of the United States take greater advantage of the public schools, apparently, than do those of native-born persons. This seems a surprising statement, a surprising fact, but it seems to be a fact, nevertheless. The Census of 1900 presents a statement of the number and nativity of children between the ages of 5 and 14 at school in 1900, also the total number of children between the ages of five and fourteen. A study of this statement shows that 65 per cent. of the children between these ages, born of native parents, were reported as attending school, while 71 per cent. of those of like age limits, born of foreign-born parents, were reported as attending school. These figures relate solely to white persons. It is proper to add that, of those between the ages of fifteen and twenty, a larger percentage of those born of native parents were in school than was the case with children of foreign-born parents; but as to the education obtained prior to the age of fifteen, it would seem that the citizens of foreign birth are, as a whole, more faithful in urging the attendance of their children at the public schools than the native parents.

Another and even more striking fact developed by a study of the Census of 1900 is, that the illiteracy among persons born in the United States of foreign parents is much less than among those born of native parents. This may seem difficult of belief, but if the skeptical will turn to page CVI. of the second volume of the Census for 1900, they will there find a table which shows that of the 30,404,762 white persons, ten years of age and over, born of native parents, no less than 1,737,050, or 5.7 per cent., were classed as illiterates; while of the 10,958,803 native whites, ten years of age and over, born of foreign parents, only 179,384, or 1.6 per cent., were classed as illiterates.

It would appear from this analysis that the percentage of immigrants from Russia and southern Europe who ultimately become inmates of prisons, reformatory institutions, almshouses and charitable institutions, is much smaller than of those from northern Europe; that a larger percentage of the children of the immigrants, as a whole, attend school during the years between five and fourteen than is the case among the children of native whites, and that there is a smaller percentage of illiterates among those

born in this country of foreign parents than among those born of native white parents.

The next question to consider is whether the immigrants are now coming too rapidly to be assimilated. It is generally conceded that this has not been the case in the past. Certainly the standard of our population, as to industry, morality, and intelligence, even with the large foreign element which it has had for many years, has compared favorably with that of other countries. And while the immigration is larger now than ever before, it is no larger in proportion to the population than on many former occasions. It must be remembered that the native-born population of the United States has rapidly increased in recent years; and that even though twice as many immigrants are now coming to the country as in some former periods, they find twice as many native-born Americans to assist them in adopting American customs and becoming good American citizens. The following table gives the population of the United States and the share of native and foreign born at each decennial year since 1850:

Year	Native Born.	Foreign Born.	Total.	Per cent. Foreign Born.
1850	20,947,274	2,244,602	23,191,876	9.7
1860	27,304,624	4,138,697	31,443,321	13.2
1870	32,991,142	5,567,229	38,558,371	16.8
1880	43,475,840	6,679,943	50,155,783	13.3
1890	53,761,652	9,308,104	63,069,756	14.7
1900	65,843,302	10,460,085	76,303,387	13.6

With this evidence that the immigration now coming does not, apparently, add more to the dependent or criminal class than that which has always been welcomed, and the evidence that the foreign-born population contributes as well educated a succeeding generation to the population of the country as do the native whites, we may consider the effect of immigration upon industry and production, upon wealth and general prosperity and the political government of the nation. To do this, it is necessary to determine the location in which the persons who have come as immigrants have settled. If we can find a group of States containing most of the persons of foreign birth, we may, perhaps, by comparing conditions in those States with conditions in the others which have but few of that class, draw some inferences as to the effect of the presence or absence of this class of population. A careful study of the Census figures of 1900 develops the fact that

over three-fourths of the foreign-born population of the United States are located in twelve of the fifty States and Territories of the United States. These twelve States are New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and California. They contain just one-half of the total population of the United States, 78 per cent. of the total foreign-born population, and 81 per cent. of what has been called the "objectionable class," which comprises the Italians, Hungarians, Austrians, Bohemians, and Poles, except those from German Poland.

Here, then, is an opportunity to study conditions in two groups of States, in which the relative share of the foreign-born population to the total population is contrasted with sufficient sharpness to justify the assumption that the presence or absence of a foreign-born population has something to do with the relative wealth-producing power and consequent prosperity. It goes without saying that in such a country as this, with lands to put under cultivation, with mines to develop, with railroads to build, with great river-and-harbor works to be constructed, with manufacturing and transportation rapidly developing and demanding plentiful supplies of labor, men and muscle are needed, and that such a country can assimilate and make profitable use of a larger immigration and a greater proportionate element of the class in question than other countries. And since we find in this group of twelve States just one-half of the total population of the United States, the one group having 78 per cent., and the other group only 22 per cent. of the total foreign-born population, it would seem that a study of their relative prosperity and wealth-creating power would give some suggestion as to the value or otherwise of this large element which can furnish the labor-supply necessary for such development. When to this we add the further fact that 81 per cent. of the "objectionable class" is found in the one group of States and only 19 per cent. in the other, it gives opportunity at least to consider the relation of this particular class to the industries of the sections where it abounds or does not abound.

Entering upon a consideration of conditions in the twelve States named, which, it should be remembered, have just one-half of the total population of the country, it may be said that persons of foreign birth compose 21 per cent. of the total population,

while in the other thirty-eight States and Territories having the other one-half of the total population, persons of foreign birth form but 6 per cent. of the total population. In the twelve States, the "objectionable class" forms 3.7 per cent. of the total; in the other thirty-eight States and Territories it forms less than one per cent. of the total. The twelve States had in 1900 a population of 38,105,863, with a total foreign-born population of 8,073,676, of which 1,445,099 was of the "objectionable class." The other thirty-eight States and Territories had in 1900 a population of 38,043,523, a foreign-born population of 2,295,629, of which 336,655 was of the "objectionable class."

The first measurement of prosperity which suggests itself is that of wealth-producing power. If we find in those States whose population is composed of 21 per cent. of foreign born, a much greater *per capita* of wealth produced than in those having but 6 per cent. of foreign-born population, we may assume that the labor of this element contributes, in some degree at least, to that greater wealth-producing power, and this will be especially true if we find that many of the States of the larger group have an equally fruitful soil and even more hospitable climate, equally promising mineral resources, and as favorable conditions for manufacturing. The chief elements of wealth production may be classed as the products of agriculture, the products of the mines, and the value added to raw materials by manufacturing. In attempting to determine the value of wealth created in these two groups of States in the Census year 1900, the total value of agricultural products is taken, the total value of the products of the mines, and the total value of manufactures turned out, less the value of the material used in manufacturing. While this is, of course, only a rough approximation of the total wealth created, since it does not include buildings, railroads constructed, or improvements to property of any kind, it does seem to give approximately the value of the wealth created from the principal sources, and seems to be at least a fair method of comparing conditions of wealth production in the various States and groups of States.

Taking this method of measurement and applying it to the two great groups of States, it is found that the wealth created by these three principal methods in the twelve States having one-half of the total population and 78 per cent. of the foreign-born population was, in 1900, \$6,832,000,000, and that in the other

group, having the other half of the total population and but 22 per cent. of the foreign-born population, it was \$4,537,000,000. In the case of the twelve States having 78 per cent. of the foreign-born population and one-half of the total, the wealth production from these three sources was \$179.31 *per capita*; in the other group, it was \$119.98 *per capita*. Official figures of 1890 gave 60 per cent. of the total wealth of the country to the group of twelve States, and 40 per cent. to the group of thirty-eight States. The relative proportion of foreign-born population in 1890 did not differ materially from that of 1900. So it may be said that the one group of States having one-half of the total population and 78 per cent. of those of foreign birth, had in 1890 60 per cent. of the total wealth and produced in 1900 60 per cent. of the total wealth produced in that year; while the other group with an equal population, but only 22 per cent. of the foreign-born population, had but 40 per cent. of the wealth in 1890 and produced but 40 per cent. of the wealth produced in 1900.

It is true that much of this great production of wealth in the twelve States named is due to the presence of greater capital invested in manufacturing and mining, but it is also true that these industrial enterprises are rendered successful only by the co-operation of labor, much of which is obtained from the large foreign-born element of the population.

One other question worthy of consideration is that of the relation of the foreign-born voters to the political government of the communities of which they are members. It is often charged that they are a dangerous factor in politics, local and national, that they are easily influenced by corrupt men, and that their votes are in many cases a purchasable quantity. This may be true, and probably is in a greater or less degree; yet a close analysis of the voting power of the foreign-born citizens does not show that they are, as a class, as attentive to politics as might be supposed from the assertions which are frequently made on that subject. The Massachusetts Labor Bureau has recently made a careful analysis of the foreign-born citizenship of that State in this particular, and finds that 34.7 per cent. of the persons of foreign birth who are eligible for citizenship and for the exercise of the voting power, have deliberately failed to take advantage of that privilege and have not become naturalized citizens. This does not look as though the foreign-born citizen was especially "ad-

dicted to politics." A further study of this analysis shows that this is especially true of what is termed the "objectionable class," viz., the Italians, Russians, and Poles. The analysis shows that 56 per cent. of the Russians, 58 per cent. of the Poles and 62 per cent. of the Italians in Massachusetts who are eligible for citizenship have failed to become citizens, while of the Irish, only 21 per cent. and of the Germans only 25 per cent. failed to take advantage of their privilege to become voters. Another interesting fact in this analysis is worthy of mention. It is now generally conceded, even by many of those who supported Mr. Bryan in 1896, that the silver proposition which formed the basis of the contest of that year, was a mistake, was not justified by conditions. It is well remembered that the hope of those opposed to the silver proposition in that contest lay in the foreign-born voters, and that their confidence in this respect was not misplaced. The twelve States which have been here named as having 78 per cent. of the foreign-born population had given 102 electoral votes to the Democratic candidate in 1892, and 101 to the Republican candidate; yet, in 1896, those same States gave 202 electoral votes to the party opposed to the free-silver proposition, and one to the party favoring it.

These figures and conclusions are not absolute, but they may be considered as at least suggestive. It is hard to measure an element of this peculiar character by hard and fast lines, or to apply the statistical measuring rod with an assurance of obtaining exact results in the way of conclusions. But they do seem to suggest (1) that the present immigration, large as it is, is not beyond our power of assimilation and probably of healthful assimilation; (2) that the so-called "objectionable class" is not the class which is filling the jails and almshouses; (3) that while they are somewhat deficient in the matter of education, that of their children is likely to compare favorably with that of our own population, and that they will thus contribute a safe and valuable element to the future population of the country; (4) that they are not, as a class, as dangerous an element in politics as has been frequently asserted; and (5) that they are an important factor in the development and wealth-producing power of the country, and that their coming, subject to proper restrictions, seems still likely to prove a net benefit to the country.

O. P. AUSTIN.

INDUSTRIAL LIBERTY, NOT INDUSTRIAL ANARCHY.

BY HENRY LOOMIS NELSON, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE IN
WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

RECENT signs indicate that at least some leaders of labor-unions realize that the employment of lawless power for the enforcement of union demands will eventually not be tolerated by the community, and that it may even destroy unions. Attempts have been made in creeds, to deny theories and beliefs that are asserted in practice. Probably, these attempts are not always the result of a return of the sane and law-abiding mind, but are frequently expressions of a fear of growing public opinion against the present conduct of strikes, and against extravagant doctrines which, though denied in words, are often declared in deeds. It is clearly true, notwithstanding the formal denial of some labor leaders and of some social philosophers, that the essential error still controls the majority of aggressive unionists. This error is, that industrial liberty and industrial anarchy are the same. Indeed, it is not uncommon to confound liberty with anarchy; but, in this instance, by reason of this confusion of thought, the "third party" in a strike is threatened with loss of rights and with suffering.

The danger will continue to exist as long as any considerable number of people believe that any voluntary association may endeavor to compel any one, or any group or class of people, to yield to its wishes and to grant its demands. Whether the voluntary association be of capitalists or of working-men, the assertion of the right to employ force, or to resort to intimidation which amounts to force, is hostile to the state. It is, moreover, in many instances, the assertion by a voluntary association, always a minority of the community, of the possession of a power which

every constitutional state has denied to its own government. It is, in fact, a demand of the right to interfere with individual liberty, the liberty which each member of the community reserves to himself in surrendering those rights which must be yielded for the sake of the common weal—a liberty which is as sacred as the power of the state itself, and the protection of which is quite as much the duty of the state as is the enforcement of the powers bestowed upon the state's government.

One of the great difficulties in the way of the discussion of labor problems is an age-old mistake of the humane and sympathetic mind. Many of our most eminent social philosophers, men of heart and of impulsive speech, forget the law which orders and defends liberty, the law by means of which civilization, with its diffusion of comfort, has advanced, the law which promotes the general welfare, in their sentimentalism awakened and stimulated by what they regard as the wrongs of a class, meaning often the weakness of a class, or the demerits of individual members of the class. In their fever of sympathy, they would resort to the ancient folly of compelling goodness when what is needed is the enforcement of justice. The time will surely come when the relations between the employer and the employed will be better, more humane, more Christian, than they are to-day; but the coming of that time will not be hastened by legislation, nor by whimsical, therefore despotic, administrative spasms; it will come when the mutual relations of all men are improved by the enlightenment of mind and of soul, by the enlargement of wisdom, and by the softening of manners.

In the meantime, it is well to dwell upon a few fundamental truths which are here applied to the problem of the labor organization, but which are as applicable to the employer as to the employed. And especially are they applicable to those who are charged with the tasks and duties of government; for, in these later days, the politician has been the greatest of sinners in labor disputes through which the innocent "third party" has suffered.

The only authority which may limit industrial or civil liberty is the state; and the limitations which our law has placed upon the conduct of the individual, as a member of the community and as a neighbor, guard the liberty which is the right of every citizen of our free state. The law limits liberty for the welfare of society and for the happiness of the individual. It gives to soci-

ety peace and order, the security of respected precedents, the wisdom of long-accepted tradition; it gives to the individual the freedom of his opportunities, by means of which he may develop the powers with which he is endowed, and, as he thus attains the fullest and highest achievements of which his nature is capable, he will inevitably promote the interests of society.

The law gives to all citizens who are engaged in industry, to capitalist and to laborer, the right to work. It protects the fruits of a man's labor, his property and his control of his property, from plunder, from intrusion, and from denial. It forbids every man to prevent his fellows from doing with their own what seems best to them, so long as they keep within the law. It gives to the individual working-man the right of free contract, the right to choose his employment and his employer, the right to work for any wage which he may agree to receive; the law denies to the individual working-man the right to compel an employer to use or to manage his property in accordance with another's will, or against the will, or against the interests, or against the fancy, of the owner; and it forbids him to deprive a fellow working-man of the right to labor, or forcibly to interfere with the free exercise of that right.

The law gives us an ordered industrial liberty, as it gives us an ordered civil liberty. Whoever invades the liberty which is guarded by the state is an enemy of the state and of society. There would be no industrial liberty but for the limitations of the law; and, without restraint, industry itself would hardly exist. Certainly, if there had been no industrial liberty, the modern achievements of industry would not have been gained. The law which restrains a man from injuring his neighbors, and which protects him from the passions and from the dishonesty of those neighbors, has been vindicated by the history of men and of industry.

The exercise of the lawful rights of men who are engaged in industry has resulted in the wonderful industrial achievements of our time. It is by freedom that men have advanced in the arts of civilization. Under freedom, the community has prospered by the development of the individual; wherever legislatures or trade-unions have undertaken to add to, or to change, or to abolish, the wholesome regulations of the fundamental law, we have had the degradation of the individual. Working alone or in combination

with others, the individual has changed the face of the world and has elevated humanity. The gains of our civilization during the last hundred years have been largely the gains of industry, and these have been made possible by *combinations* of men, by harmonious combinations—not by those which have sought to bring the workers to a level with one another either in effort or in wages, or which have sought to take the control and direction of the property and its business from the responsible owner, or from the manager expert in adopting economies of production, in anticipating the course of the market, or the changes in public taste. Efficiency has not resulted from the effort to give the hand which works control over the mind which plans and which conducts. Nowhere are the material accomplishments of individuals so great and so obvious as are those of the American inventor, producer, distributor, capitalist. His untiring energy; his acute intelligence; his wisdom in recognizing that for his own good he must work for the good of all; the boldness and ability with which he uses, in the service of industry, his own capital and the capital of those who have faith in him; have brought forth fruits of the abundance and wealth of which the country is hardly conscious. The work of this controlling individual has resulted in a saving in the cost of production of from forty to more than eighty per cent. In many establishments five men can now do the work which, a few years ago, required the labor of from eight to ten men, with more satisfactory results, while each man receives a larger wage than was paid in the earlier times.

Temporary and natural causes may increase, or decrease, the cost of living, or may advance, or lower, the rate of wages; but, in a hundred years, that industrial freedom which is granted and guarded by the law, has enormously elevated the human race. The nobleman of the days of Charles II., in the joyous period of the Restoration, possessed many of the luxuries of domestic life, dwelt in houses as beautiful and as commodious as our best, read a literature which we continue to count among our most precious possessions, and saw the beginnings of those applications of the laws of science which have given to dwellers in cottages more wholesome houses, sounder health, and longer lives than kings enjoyed in the splendid days when the capabilities of all men were not yet free. The civilized world has been turned into one great neighborhood by individual enterprise.

The voluntary combination of human forces has added to the wealth of the whole, and in this accomplishment the men who have worked for wages have gained, relatively, the most. While establishments and men have decreased, as in the iron and steel business from 1880 to 1900, in the one case, and in the British marine in the other case, production and wages have both increased. In these twenty years the number of iron and steel establishments in the United States decreased from 1,005 to 668; in the same period the number of wage-earners increased about fifty-eight per cent., while the total wages increased 120 per cent. At the same time, the capital which worked with labor for this result increased nearly 150 per cent. The census of 1900 shows that, in the twenty years, in fifteen selected industries, employing from 2,732,000 to more than 5,000,000 wage-earners, while the increase in number of wage-earners was about 94 per cent., the increase in amount of wages paid was 145 per cent.

Efforts have been made at various times in the world's history to change the industrial system. The Socialists assure us that the whole community acting together can accomplish more for mankind than the individual; but this movement will succeed only when the task of administering productive and distributive instruments is no longer important, or when the single trained mind can do no better administrative work than can be done by the voting majority of a community or of a voluntary association. We are told that society ought to furnish the capital for industrial enterprises, to the end that the workmen actually employed in the tasks of production and distribution may possess and enjoy all the fruits of their labor. The experiment was tried in France in 1848. Despite the fact, however, that French working-men have displayed greater capacity than the workmen of other countries for co-operation in production, the experiment was a dismal failure, the capital was wasted, and the wage-earners who participated were the greatest sufferers.

Not only do the limitations of the law protect the freedom of men, their right to work, their right to the property which they earn, that freedom of contract without the possession of which the wage-earner has not his civil liberty, but industrial liberty thus ordered and fortified has resulted in the magical gains which have given to us a new material world. Modern methods have also elevated the wage-earner from the condition of the "malicious

servant" of the fourteenth century "Statute of Laborers," to the working-man of to-day. Increase of production has increased his reward; diversity of employment has enlarged his skill; the system of corporations has not only given to him the advantage of the capital, of the active, persisting energy of the achievements of the past, but has given him the opportunity of ownership as he did not before possess it.

So much for the achievements of the individual workers, capitalists and working-men in association, under the rule of the law which protects individual liberty. The employer of labor is contending for the maintenance of a system which has brought to us with accumulation of wealth, abundance of comfort, of ease, of welfare, of rich opportunities for repose that, in its turn, if rightly used, gives an opportunity for the improvement of the intellectual and spiritual side of man. The community is as deeply concerned as the employer in maintaining this ordered liberty, for it is civilization itself which is thereby advanced. The wage-earner also ought to struggle for his industrial liberty as he would struggle for his political liberty if it were attacked; but the "social unrest," as it is called, which has always existed, and which will exist for years, perhaps for ages hence, because men with equal rights to liberty do not possess equal minds, equal characters, equal capabilities,—this "social unrest" searches in industrial tyranny for an impossible cure for an imaginary evil.

Probably, no one will be found to question the right of the wage-earners to combine, or their right to take advantage of their legal opportunities to obtain larger and larger shares of the products which they help to make or to bring forth from the earth. No one will deny that it is wise for the employers of labor to consult with their own working-men. It is true that sometimes restraint of trade follows such discussions, but the halt which is called upon an industry in prosperous times by a demand of the wage-earners for higher pay, and by a refusal of the demand, is in obedience to a law of nature. No human law can prevent it. Nothing will prevent it but the wisdom of the employer in anticipating the wage-earner, and in giving him a share in the increased prosperity of the business. But aggressive limitations upon industrial liberty, beyond those imposed by the law to protect and advance that liberty, constitute industrial lawlessness and industrial tyranny. In the fourteenth century in England the government

undertook to fix the wage of the laborer, and to keep him confined to the parish in which he happened to dwell. In this century, the labor-union has followed the example of mediæval English kings and parliaments.

I am speaking only of the excessive demands and extravagant actions of many, if not of most, labor-unions. These are the subject of immediate criticism for they are the conspicuous and the harmful, as well as the most advanced, assertions of organized labor. Moreover, if the demands should be granted, or should be forced upon the community by the action of the unions, we should have a revolution in social, perhaps in political, conditions.

Labor-unions endeavor to exercise powers of government which are properly possessed and exercised by the state alone; and, more than once, one of these voluntary organizations of private citizens has actually succeeded in placing itself above the state and its government. The demand is disloyalty to the state, and seeks to replace the law with the discretion of irresponsible individuals. The law of the union to which the employees of the Government Printing-office belong, for instance, makes the union paramount over the nation, and members of it have seemed to hesitate to take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, for the reason that such an oath might conflict with their superior duty to the union. A union in New York has expelled a member because, as a soldier of the State Militia, he did his duty, not only as a citizen but as a sworn member of the State's constabulary, in aiding to defend life and property against lawless strikers. In Connecticut, a member of a union, who was also an officer of the militia, resigned his commission for fear that if he remained a soldier of the State he might be called upon to aid in enforcing its laws against riotous members of his own union. The union professes to believe that a state of war exists between employer and employed, and insists that strikers have, therefore, the right to break the ordinary laws which prevail in time of peace, to resort to the boycott, to injure the business of their enemies, and to prevent non-unionists from working. There is no better illustration of the nature of this lawlessness than that which is furnished by the findings of the Anthracite-Coal Strike Commission of 1903. The Commission adjudged as follows:

"Its history is stained with a record of riot and bloodshed, culminating in three murders, unprovoked save by the fact that two of the victims

were asserting their right to work, and another, as an officer of the law, was performing his duty, in attempting to preserve the peace. Men who chose to be employed, or who remained at work, were assailed and threatened, and they and their families terrorized and intimidated. In several instances, the houses of such workmen were dynamited, or otherwise assaulted, and the lives of unoffending women and children put in jeopardy. The armed guard, employed to protect the collieries and the men who worked them, appears not to have been an unnecessary precaution, and the Governor of the State was, as the evidence before the Commission shows, justified in calling out the citizen soldiery of the commonwealth to preserve its peace and vindicate its laws."

Speaking of what it called the "primary boycott," the Commission thus condemned it:

"The right and liberty to pursue a lawful calling and to lead a peaceable life, free from molestation or attack, concerns the comfort and happiness of all men, and the denial of them means destruction of one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of the benefits which the social organization confers. What is popularly known as the boycott (a word of evil omen and unhappy origin) is a form of coercion by which a combination of many persons seek to work their will upon a single person, or upon a few persons, by compelling others to abstain from social or beneficial business intercourse with such person or persons. Carried to the extent sometimes practised in aid of a strike, and as was in some instances practised in connection with the late anthracite strike, it is a cruel weapon of aggression, and its use immoral and anti-social."

The Commissioners furthermore gave these instances of what they called the "secondary boycott":

"A young schoolmistress of intelligence, character, and attainments, was so boycotted, and her dismissal from employment compelled, for no other reason than that a brother, not living in her immediate family, chose to work contrary to the wishes and will of the striking miners. A lad, about fifteen years old, employed in a drug store, was discharged, owing to threats made to his employer by a delegation of the strikers, on behalf of their organization, for the reason that his father had chosen to return to work before the strike was ended."

The offences thus described by the Commissioners show that, in the anthracite strike, war was waged against the liberty of the individual; the operators were unlawfully forbidden to employ any one distasteful to the union; and the non-union men were unlawfully forbidden to work. Here, also, was war against society and the state, for the union broke the peace and order of the commonwealth. To one who recognizes the sanctity of that

fundamental law by the observance of which savage liberty has been restrained, while ordered liberty has been established in its place, it is clear that it is the duty, not only of employers alone, but of all good citizens, to resist such lawless pretensions, and to refuse to yield to demands for higher wages or shorter hours when they are made by rioters and law-breakers.

It is also true that the labor-union in this anthracite strike, as in other strikes, and in more than one written constitution, has insisted upon the right to exercise control over the property of the employer. The employer is responsible, under the law, for the management of his property, responsible to society and to the individual, responsible for the use of this property in obedience to the law; but union leaders or delegates, representing unincorporated organizations, demand control, although they have no responsibility for the management of the business, although they insist on operating outside of and against the law, and although they may not be interested in the property beyond the earning of wages in its service, while some have not even that interest. They attempt to restrain the employer of his liberty by designating the men whom he shall hire; by deciding for him questions of discipline which affect the value or the product of his property; by determining the rate of wages which he shall pay, regardless of the fact, as in a recent strike, that the earnings of the business may not warrant the payment, and, therefore, notwithstanding the further fact that his surrender to the demand would bring loss of dividend, or of profit, to the owner, and loss of employment to the working-man. The boycott, the picket, and other forms of violence are resorted to for the purpose of compelling accession to these demands.

These efforts to limit industrial liberty are, as I have said, the excesses of labor-unions, but they grow out of a claim of right which is universal among the unions and their indiscriminating defenders. This claim is, that the wage-earner may demand as a right what is purely a subject for free contract between the employer and his own employees. Demands for shorter hours, for higher pay, or for the adoption of a sliding scale, are proper subjects for voluntary discussion and agreement, but the law of man and the law of morality forbid any citizen, whether he be laborer or capitalist, to enforce his demands by violence, by the oppression of others, by a denial to any man of his right to work for whom

he will and for what he will, of his right to hire any man for what that man is willing to accept. Against such action by the labor-unions, it is the duty of the employer to contend, not only as a citizen, but as an individual whose rightful liberty is sought to be invaded and, perhaps, destroyed. It is the duty of the community also to withstand these exaggerated demands, not only because the state is charged with the maintenance of order, and with the preservation of life and property, but because it is bound to enforce obedience to all its laws, and especially to breed a wholesome respect for that law which defends individual liberty.

It is also the duty of the citizen and of the state to defend the old and tried industrial system, which, through the operation of the free mind and the free hand of the free man, alone or incorporated with others, has given us the splendid gains of the inventors, of the adventurous and far-sighted directors of industrial enterprises, and of the wise and courageous capitalist who, having faith in the future, has embarked his property in services which are for mankind as well as for himself. The contention of the employer that he will recognize in a controversy between himself and them only the men who are engaged in his own business, conceding their right to be represented, ought to be upheld by the free community. In essence, the issue here is between the free citizen and communism. The corporation gives to industry the advantage of combined capital, which is a concentration of force. It does not interfere with the liberty of him who owns and manages the property, or with the liberty of him who works for wages. It gives to the one the added strength of larger capital, the opportunities for greater economies, for cheaper production, and for larger and more numerous markets. The wide distribution of shares gives to the wage-earner an opportunity for ownership which he did not enjoy in the day of the partnership. The corporation, in a word, helps the individual to rise, for the prosperity of the corporation, like the advancement of civilization itself, depends upon the gains of the free exceptional individual. Opposed to this system is that of common ownership, or of communism, in which the property of the community would be controlled and directed by a majority of the whole. Instead of the judgment and decision of the experienced and trained man on administrative questions, we should have the opinion of the majority, probably the greater part of whom would have no personal interest in the

subject, while many of them might be wholly ignorant of it. The trade-union endeavors to apply the communistic principle to industrial controversies by insisting that the employer shall not treat with his own employees alone, the men who are his fellow workmen in the same enterprise, the only men who, with himself, will feel directly the good or the evil, the loss or the gain, the ruin or the prosperity which must come from the decision of the conference; but it asserts that he must treat with labor at large, with the whole community of labor. Against the change of system thus demanded he ought to protest, because, as the political communist would place the indifferent and the weaker intelligence in control of the public business, this demand of labor would put property and business at the mercy of an incompetent majority. Already we see the consequences of majority government in industrial affairs in the rules of unions, which prevent, or which attempt to prevent, the rise of the superior man by reducing him to the level of the inefficient. In contending against this levelling communism, the employer is rendering a service to the community and to the wage-earner himself. As free citizens, the wage-earners have the right to work or to refuse to work, to demand better pay and to strike if they do not obtain it; but they *must* obey the law of the state, and they *ought* to obey that law of nature which vindicates the law of the state. Working-men themselves are the first victims of a tyranny which places obstacles in the way of the rise of their own best men, and which often may deny the right to work to the great majority of wage-earners in this country.

The time may come when unions will work wisely for the good of their members; and then they will work for the good of the community, as the English guilds in the Middle Ages, in organizing against pressure from the barons, worked for the liberty of the individual, and therefore for the political development of the commons. But, at present, those who speak the voice of the unions, and who control their conduct, are busying themselves with the task of replacing the tyranny of the Parliament of Edward III., which enacted a statute to enslave labor, with the tyranny of a majority, who would, without law and in defiance of it, enslave both capital and labor.

HENRY LOOMIS NELSON.

ANTI-CANTEEN LEGISLATION AND THE ARMY.—II.

BY C. E. LITTLEFIELD, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE Hon. Elihu Root, late Secretary of War, opposed the anti-canteen legislation, and expressed before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs the apprehension that it would discourage enlistments, saying on that point:

"If you pass the provision which the House has put in, prohibiting the sale of beer and light wines in the Canteen, you break that up, and the result is going to be, as soon as it gets round, it will stop our enlistments. That is a matter of serious, practical consequence. The men are not going to enlist when they understand that they are going to be confined in a reform school."

It must gratify Mr. Root to know that this doleful apprehension was unfounded, as this official table shows:

<i>Enlistments.</i>			
Year.	Per Month.	Year.	Per Month.
1889	800	1897	690
1890	654	1898	5,793
1891	703	1899	5,181
1892	821	1900	1,629
1893	756	1901	2,552
1894	654	1902	3,122
1895	648	1903	1,587
1896	707		

1898 and 1899 were war years, when enlistments are always greater, and the figures for these years include a large number of volunteer soldiers as distinguished from regulars.

The two whole years 1901--2 show an average of 2,837 as against an average of 715 per year for the nine years prior to the war, and under normal Canteen conditions, or four times as many per

year when the "reform school" was staring the recruit in the face. The "reform school" does not appear to have been a very vigorous deterrent. During the latter period, moreover, the Government has been exercising greater care in the selection of its men. Where 30,622 were enlisted in the year ending June 30th, 1901, 86,407 applications were rejected. During the year 1902, while 37,461 enlisted, 87,081 applications were rejected; and during the year 1903, 18,961 were enlisted and 74,256 rejected, showing that now where they enlist one they reject about three or four. The instructions for recruiting issued September 23rd, 1901, no doubt account for these rejections and also show the unfavorable conditions under which enlistments have largely increased. The first requirement was, that "applicants for first enlistment must be between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five years, of good character and temperate habits, able-bodied, free from disease, and must be able to speak, read and write the English language." Inasmuch as, under the War Department's theory of the Canteen, the recruit is to be at once introduced to the official sale of beer in the Canteen, and the maximum of sale is essential to the maximum of prosperity of the Canteen, this regulation should read "of good character and temperate habits, vigorous and efficient consumers of beer, of approved capacity preferred, etc." While the considerations heretofore suggested certainly at least tend to destroy the value of statistics, comparing the Canteen period with the years preceding and succeeding it, so far as the Anti-Canteen law is concerned, there are other reasons which are also potent to show that these statistics do not justify the conclusions sought to be drawn therefrom. I cannot state them more effectively than they have been stated by a practical soldier, who has won his rank by brave, gallant and heroic conduct in battle, on the firing line, in every war in which the army has been engaged since 1861, including the Expedition to China in 1900, Brigadier-General Daggett, U. S. A. He says:

"Captain Munson, Assistant-Surgeon, U. S. Army, has published statistics which seem to favor the Canteen. The Army has been constantly improving since its reorganization in 1866. Then, a very large proportion of the officers had just been appointed from the volunteers and from civil life. They were unfamiliar with the ways and regulations of garrison life. Not many, if any, officers were familiar with the conditions at that time. All had to learn, from the highest to the lowest. The

class of recruits was the worst that has ever been introduced into the Army. The barracks were poor, dirty, forbidding buildings, poorly lighted and heated. Candles were used, and a small allowance of them at that. Bunks were of rough boards and three stories high. A bed sack, filled with straw, and a blanket or two furnished the soldier's bed. A tin plate, an iron knife, fork and spoon, were his table utensils. The principal ration was bacon, or pork, occasionally beef, and bread, coffee, sugar and beans.

"Improvement in these things began in the '70's. Now the barracks are warm, cheerful and well lighted. The beds and mess are much better than most recruits enjoyed at their homes. Then the recruiting officer could enlist whomsoever he pleased. Since then, he has been held responsible for the utmost care in selecting men, morally and physically, on penalty of having to pay the expenses of clothing, feeding and transporting the recruit to his station, should he be rejected after arriving, and should it be shown that the recruiting officer had been negligent.

"Benevolent societies also began to furnish the soldiers with reading matter, etc. Many other things were done for the betterment of the soldiers. The army of new officers of 1866, after fifteen or twenty years of experience, had learned how to command and care for men. Too much importance cannot be attached to this consideration. The fruits of all these things must necessarily have been a great reduction in desertions, admissions to hospital for alcoholism, and convictions by court-martial.

"Now, Mr. Munson comes in and gives the Canteen credit, largely, for these improvements. He makes 1889, the date of formal establishment of the Canteen by the War Department, the central period of reckoning. The Canteen had existed to some extent for four years before that time, but leave that out of consideration. The number of desertions from 1867 to 1874 was equal to 20.5 per cent. From 1876 to 1880, they were equal to 8.4 per cent. President Hayes prohibited the sale of intoxicants to post-traders during this period. From 1881 to 1889, the number of desertions was equal to 12 per cent. From 1890 to 1897, 5 per cent. From 1898 to 1900, 4.4 per cent. From 1900 to 1901, only 1.9 per cent. This latter period is not for the whole year, but up to a recent date, but there has been no Canteen since February 2nd.

"The number of admissions to hospital for alcoholism during the Canteen period, from 1891 to 1897, decreased 12.2 per thousand, while during the preceding period, from 1882 to 1890, the number decreased 27.3 per thousand.

"These statistics show that a decrease in desertions and admissions to hospital for alcoholism began long before the Canteen was thought of, and has been going on up to the present time, and that it was more rapid before than since the Canteen was established."

General Daggett makes the following suggestions:

"(1) Establish ample and attractive reading-rooms, which may be the general places of resort, and where games and facilities for all sorts of proper social enjoyments can be found.

- “ (2) Establish ample and attractive gymnasiums.
 “ (3) Encourage and give facilities for all proper kinds of manly sports.
 “ (4) Require the Commissary Department to supply many of the luxuries now furnished by means of the company fund.”

These are covered by the appropriations made and proposed.

Moreover, the following tables taken from official records and reports, comparing the Canteen period with subsequent years, although in the absence of the proposed recreation buildings and company fund, essential to the success of the legislation, give results that on the whole are unfavorable to the Canteen.

Cases of Alcoholism, United States Army.

Year.	Mean Strength.	Rate, per 1,000.	Year.	Mean Strength.	Rate, per 1,000.
1889.....	25,908	41.43	1896.....	25,119	29.06
1890.....	24,234	40.73	1897.....	25,417	27.86
1891.....	23,928	40.01	1898.....	46,635	15.16
1892.....	24,203	37.23	1899.....	64,446	18.70
1893.....	25,287	33.97	1900.....	68,955	18.38
1894.....	25,376	30.94	1901.....	81,885	23.80
1895.....	25,204	30.11	1902.....	80,778	22.65

This shows an average rate per 1,000, from 1889 to 1900 inclusive (excluding the war years), of 32.97 per year for the Canteen period, an average of 16.93 for the war years, and of 23.23 for the years 1901--2 without the Canteen, or 9.74 better than the Canteen period. The percentage of convictions for drunkenness, based upon fiscal years, taken from the Judge-Advocate-General's report for 1903, shows:

Year.	Rate, per 1,000.	Year.	Rate, per 1,000.
1889	1.4	1896	1.0
1890	1.6	1897	1.1
1891	1.6	1898	1.1
1892	1.7	1899	1.2
1893	1.4	1900	2.3
1894	1.2	1902	1.2
1895	.9	1903	1.2

The average percentage for the Canteen period was 1.3+; the rate since the Canteen period was 1.2, leaving out the year 1901, as that was divided between the two periods, a difference against the Canteen of .1+.

Sickness in the Army.

Year.	Admission to Hospital.	Rate, per 1,000	Year.	Admission to Hospital.	Rate, per 1,000.
1889.....	32,886	1,315.02	1896.....	27,892	1,110.39
1890.....	33,546	1,384.25	1897.....	30,160	1,186.61
1891.....	31,757	1,364.78	1898.....	317,195	2,146.18
1892.....	30,748	1,270.42	1899.....	229,885	2,178.06
1893.....	32,596	1,289.04	1900.....	232,080	2,311.81
1894.....	27,653	1,089.73	1901.....	165,706	1,791.59
1895.....	27,982	1,110.22	1902.....	138,656	1,716.51

This gives an average rate per thousand of 1,343.23 for the Canteen period of 1889--1900, inclusive (excluding the war years), 2,162.09 for the war years, and 1,754.05 since the Canteen.

While this shows a considerable increase over the Canteen period, it must be remembered that the larger part of the Army has during the latter period been subjected to unusually unhealthy conditions by service in the tropics not previously experienced.

Desertions in the Army.

Year.	Mean Strength.	Percentage of Desertions.	Year.	Mean Strength.	Percentage of Desertions.
1889.....	25,564	11.	1897.....	25,304	2.9
1890.....	24,930	7.7	1898.....	44,397	4.
1891.....	24,525	5.7	1899.....	62,019	4.9
1892.....	24,867	5.7	1900.....	66,460	4.4
1893.....	25,670	6.3	1901.....	78,863	5.2
1894.....	25,661	3.6	1902.....	71,294	7.5
1895.....	25,200	5.3	1903 (six mos.)	61,498	2.8
1896.....	25,143	3.4			

This table from the Adjutant-General's report is based on calendar years, and shows an average for the Canteen period of 5.79 per cent., and since of 5.66 per cent., a difference against the Canteen of .13 per cent.

The figures furnished by the Lieutenant-General, in his report for 1901, show that the desertions have been gradually decreasing since 1867, when the percentage was 26.7. For the next twelve years, the average was 16.5, for the decade ending 1888 the average was 11.4, and for the twenty-two years preceding 1889 the average was 14.2, showing that the decrease in desertions has been due not to the Canteen, but to other causes. These are to some extent pointed out by Acting-Judge-Advocate Captain C. D. Roberts, of the Department of Texas, in his annual report dated June 16th, 1903, in which he says:

"The large number of trials for desertion in this department in the last two years is due largely to the great number of recruits in the

ranks and the number of new and inexperienced officers. The three-year enlistment is undoubtedly bad for discipline. The general mess system is in operation at Forts Bliss and Sam Houston, and to this system is undoubtedly due some of the trials at those posts, since under it there is always more or less discontent among the troops with the food furnished and the cooking."

The fact that the existing conditions furnish no proper criterion upon which to base a comparison also appears from the official report of the Inspector-General for the year 1903. He says:

"It is more the exception than the rule that prescribed regulations for the government of the post exchanges are strictly complied with. . . . The reports for 64 posts in the United States, Alaska, Cuba, Porto Rico and Honolulu, show that 14 had no post exchanges, and at the 50 having them the rooms used for that purpose were generally unattractive, not satisfactory, and lacking in accommodations. At 20 of these 50, they were especially mentioned as unsuitable. At a few posts suitable buildings were being constructed for exchange and gymnastic purposes. The reports for 94 posts in the Philippine Islands show only 8 enjoying the privilege of an exchange. There were many desertions and few reenlistments at a number of posts. Drunkenness and absence without leave are noted in reports, and trials by courts-martial are very numerous. *It is believed that a well-regulated post exchange and a thoroughly equipped gymnasium would accomplish more toward contentment and discipline in the Army than almost anything the Government can, under the law, accomplish.*"

Major Elijah W. Halford's statement of conditions in the Philippines emphasizes this idea. He says:

"A temperance Canteen has been tried in at least four posts here in the Islands, with good measure of success. At one post sales amounted to \$500 per month; profits averaged \$135 monthly during the eighty days it had been operated when report was made. It had very limited facilities; no capital, poor room, no sympathy from the officers, no soda fountain, hard to get ice, and other obstacles. With good facilities, with the sympathy of officers, and eliminating the poorly-disguised devil of profit as in the old Canteen, this is the practical solution of the 'Canteen' question for all soldiers except the chronic drinkers, who will have whiskey anyway, beer Canteen or no beer Canteen. These begin their drunks in the beer Canteen, but end them outside in the whiskey shops."

The attitude of the War Department as to this legislation is an essential feature affecting its success. On the 5th of February, 1901, three days after the anti-canteen law was enacted, the Adjutant-General issued an order for the collection of statistics

showing the operation of the law, "report thereon to be made to this office not later than September 1st next," covering a period of the non-existence of conditions essential to its success, during which the law might be expected to result adversely. On February 19th, 1901, Senator Gallinger, an earnest friend of the legislation, introduced, as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill, the following:

"Difference between the cost of the ration at 25 cents and the amount of 26½ cents, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War for the purpose of laying out, preparing, and cultivating gardens, and supplying seeds, roots, and plants for the same: the purchase of books, periodicals, stationery, etc., for the post exchange library: the purchase of gymnastic appliances: prizes for athletic sports: towards the support of regimental bands: for the purchase of articles of food other than those supplied by the regular ration: and for the further improvement of the post exchange, to be equally distributed among the enlisted men, \$547,500."

Practically the company-fund idea, though it is believed that the fund should be apportioned to companies and expended by the captain to produce the best results. This went to the military committee, where it slept the sleep of the just, as it was never reported therefrom.

In a letter to the Hon. W. J. Sewall, under date of August 29th, 1900, Adjutant-General Corbin made this statement:

"The official reports of the Department show that the receipts from sales of beer and light wines are and have been less than one-third of gross receipts, being in 1898 five-seventeenths and in 1899 six-seventeenths. Taking the amount of gross receipts on account of sale of beer and dividing it by the total number of officers and men shows that each officer and enlisted man for the year 1898 expended on account of beer only 20 cents a month—equivalent to four glasses of beer per month, or less than one glass a week apiece, for each officer and man in the military service. In 1899 the expenditure on the part of each officer and man reached an average of 58 cents per month, or but 1.9 cents a day. These facts make it clear that in comparison with all other citizens the army of to-day is the most abstemious body in our country. There is no community of which we have any report or knowledge that will show so small a consumption of drink *per capita*."

It will be observed that these conclusions are based upon statistics for the years 1898-9.

Under date of December 17th, 1903, Acting-Adjutant-General W. P. Hall wrote me a courteous letter from which I quote:

"When the troops were withdrawn from the military posts in April, 1898, and assembled in camps on the Gulf coast for the purpose of taking part in the impending war with Spain, they were compelled to abandon their post exchanges at the permanent stations, leaving behind them such stock of beer and wine as was then on hand. The most of this stock became a waste—a dead loss, in fact—for, before the troops returned to the permanent forts, the Act of March 2, 1899, had prevented its sale, and as the persons from whom it was purchased refused to take it back, it was destroyed or given away. It was nearly a year afterwards before those posts were regarrisoned, and in but very few instances by the troops which constituted the garrisons at the time of the breaking out of the war with Spain. As a consequence we were unable to get any satisfactory reports of Post Exchange transactions for the period commencing about the middle of April, 1898, to the 1st of July, 1899. . . . It would be difficult to give with any accuracy 'the number of men in the service located at the places of Posts, in 1898 and 1899, where such Canteens or Post Exchanges were being operated with the sale of beer and wine therein,' or to give 'the total sales of beer and wine at each of these Canteens' for those years."

If Acting-Adjutant-General Hall is correct, and I have no doubt he is, where there are no "satisfactory reports" for nearly nine months in 1898, and six months in 1899, and the number of men and the amount of beer and wine sold cannot be given "with any accuracy" during those years, it is difficult to imagine where General Corbin got the statistics upon which to base his very specific statement.

It has been my misfortune to endeavor to assist, in my humble way, that distinguished gentleman in making this legislation a success, and promoting the welfare of our soldiers. Mr. Francis A. Buzzacott, a member of the Third Illinois, during the Spanish War, operated a Post Exchange in connection with that regiment. The records show that, during several months of its existence, its profits cleared its original cost, and amounted in all to \$5,000, all of which was turned over to the regiment and distributed and used by its various companies during its campaign in the tropics. It was operated in a tent, mammoth in size, capable of holding fifteen hundred, and benches for three hundred troops. It had a restaurant and lunch counter, magazines and moral literature, and sold everything a soldier needed, except liquor, which was not allowed to be either sold or used on

the premises. It had an organ, and musical entertainments were given. The regiment marched in a body to divine service therein on Sunday.

It closed up two beer Canteens in its vicinity, and the soldiers boycotted their own Canteens for the temperance Canteen. On December 8th, 1900, two days after the introduction of the anti-canteen amendment, Mr. Buzzacott renewed his offer to the Secretary of War, proposing to establish a similar Canteen, to be "conducted *under military regulations*, for the recreation, benefit and modern advantages of such United States volunteer troops as are now serving in the Philippines." The proposition is too long to quote in full, but it provided for furnishing everything that was desirable or requisite for the comfort, convenience and entertainment of the men. He proposed to furnish the "money to do this." The profits, except ten per cent. to be used in establishing like Canteens in other Posts or places, were to go to the men. Three months after its establishment, he agreed to turn it "over to the Government troops completely equipped as described, free of cost or indebtedness whatsoever"; during this time it was to be under his "personal supervision and control," "*subject to the approval of the generals commanding.*"

He asked for transportation to be furnished, authority to purchase supplies of any department of the establishment at cost, that a commissioned officer be detailed as executive officer in charge, and a private soldier from each company as police, "not to interfere with other military duties." This proposition not receiving favorable action and impressing me as both feasible and commendable, I made the effort indicated by the subjoined correspondence to have it adopted by the War Department.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

"WASHINGTON, D. C.,

"ROCKLAND, ME., March 8, 1901.

"Hon. Elihu Root,

"Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am very anxious that the Canteen as now constituted, or that the Canteen in which the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited in accordance with the recent amendment to the army bill, shall prove to be successful in its operation. I have just taken occasion to examine the offer made by Mr. Francis H. Buzzacott, of Chicago, Illinois, under date of December 8, 1900, for the carrying on and operating of a temperance Canteen, and it seems to me that the offer is a very desirable

one. It involves no cost or expense to the government, and Mr. Buzzacott proposes to subject himself in all respects to the supervision and control of the Department, and the generals commanding the United States troops under whose authority he is placed at work.

"I should be very much gratified, and I certainly hope you may see your way clear to allow him to establish as many of these Canteens as he desires to, especially in the Philippines.

"If they prove to be a success I do not see any reason why they should not be located wherever our troops are located.

"If it is not asking too much I should be very glad to have you advise me of the views you take of his proposition, and the probability of its acceptance.

"Very respectfully,

"C. E. LITTLEFIELD."

"ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, WASHINGTON.

"March 11, 1901.

"Hon. C. E. Littlefield,

"House of Representatives,

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant to the Secretary of War, in which you commend to the favorable consideration of the department an offer of Mr. Francis H. Buzzacott, of Chicago, Illinois, for the carrying on and operating of a temperance Canteen, and replying thereto permit me to say that the proposition of Mr. Buzzacott has been carefully considered and does not commend itself to the department.

"Very respectfully,

"H. C. CORBIN,

"Adjutant-General."

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON.

"ROCKLAND, ME., March 14, 1901.

"General H. C. Corbin,

"Adjutant-General U. S. A., Washington, D. C.,

"MY DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 11th at hand, and I note that you say that the proposition of Mr. Buzzacott has been carefully considered and does not commend itself to the department.

"I have been advised that there was nothing unmilitary in Mr. Buzzacott's proposition, or that would be inconsistent with the regulations of the department. Will you be kind enough to advise me in what particulars the proposition did not meet the approval of the department, or the reason the department has for declining to accept it, as I may be able to procure such a modification of the proposition as will make it acceptable to the department.

"It seems to me that something of this kind is extremely desirable if the present legislation is to be successful, and I have no doubt but what the War Department is anxious to make the Canteen conducted under the existing legislation as attractive and efficient as possible, in

taking the place of the Canteen as heretofore carried on, involving the sale of beer and possibly other intoxicating drinks therein.

"Very respectfully,

"C. E. LITTLEFIELD."

"WAR DEPARTMENT,

"ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, WASHINGTON.

"March 22, 1901.

"Hon. Chas. E. Littlefield, M. C.,

"House of Representatives,

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, in the matter of the proposition of Mr. Buzzacott, to establish temperance Canteens at military posts, in which, referring to department letter of the 11th instant to the effect that the proposition of Mr. Buzzacott has been carefully considered and does not commend itself to the department, you ask to be advised in what particular the proposition does not meet the approval of the department, or the reason the department has for declining to accept.

"Replying thereto, I have the honor to remark that the proposition of Mr. Buzzacott does not commend itself to the approval of the department *for the reason that the army is perfectly capable of conducting its own affairs in respect to Post Exchanges, as well as to other matters connected with its administration*, and that the conditions vary at military posts and stations in the army, the greater portion of which is now in the field, in tropical countries, and it is believed that Mr. Buzzacott, having served in the army for a number of years in various capacities, knows as well as any other man of military experience, that the proposition to place a civilian in charge of affairs in a military command cannot be successfully carried out. Mr. Buzzacott must also be aware that the law forbids the Quartermaster's Department to furnish transportation to an establishment of this character, or for any supplies intended for it; that it forbids the sale to him and his employees of subsistence stores at cost; in fact that the residence on a military reservation of persons not in the employ of the United States government is forbidden by law. Briefly, there are other objections and difficulties to this proposition, which are too numerous to mention.

"Very respectfully,

"H. C. CORBIN,

"Adjutant-General."

In other words, if you will attend to your business I will attend to mine. I thought then, and I think now, that I had an undoubted right, in view of the fact that I was responsible in part at least for the legislation, even if it was not my duty, to deferentially offer suggestions, and invite suggestions, intended to promote its success. I thought then, and I think now, that I had a right to assume that the War Department had a due and proper regard

for the welfare of our soldiers, and was desirous of administering the law in good faith so as to make it as effective and successful as possible, so that it might prove helpful to that welfare. I supposed the War Department would cheerfully welcome anything that would contribute to that end. When, however, my well-meant and courteous advances were received by the vigorous official suggestion, that "*the army was perfectly capable of conducting its own affairs in respect to Post Exchanges, as well as to other matters connected with its administration,*" no outside interference being tolerated, the incident was closed, as it did not seem to me that any self-respecting man was required to submit himself further to "the insolence of office"; and efforts on my part to cooperate with the War Department were abandoned, even at the risk of my being afterwards charged with having wrapped about myself "the cloak of self-righteous content and left the Army to care for itself."

The first appropriation of \$500,000 for Post Exchanges was made at the next session after the passage of the amendment, and became available on July 1st, 1902. If not used prior to July 1st, 1903, it would have lapsed back into the Treasury. I am in receipt of a letter from the Department, under date of December 26th, 1903, advising me that, under the appropriation for the fiscal year of 1903, the Secretary of War had authorized expenditures in January, 1903, of \$2,712.09; in April, 1903, of \$96,417.95; in May, 1903, of \$336,995.91; and in June, 1903, of \$39,868. Not a dollar, that is to say, was authorized to be expended until the whole sum had been available six months and then only \$2,712.09; and the bulk of the appropriation, \$336,995.91, was not authorized to be expended, until it had been available more than ten months. The average percentage of completion of work under sixteen different authorizations on September 30, 1903, was forty-three per cent., only one building, at Fort Brady, Michigan, costing \$19,819, being then nearly completed.

Certainly, the War Department cannot fairly be charged with being precipitate, or with exercising undue haste. We may be fairly safe, I think, in assuming that, if this appropriation had been a revolution with a canal-site attachment, its period of gestation would not have been prolonged for ten months and sixteen days. If the War Department had been as anxious to create favorable conditions in that regard, as it was to get statistics when the

conditions essential to the success of the anti-canteen legislation were absent, and had exercised the same degree of diligence, these authorizations would have been made July 3, 1902. On the other hand, so profound has been its solicitude for the welfare of the men under its charge that, although \$500,000 has been available therefor since June 30, 1902, and \$1,000,000 since June 30, 1903, only a trifling sum up to October 30th, 1903, had been actually used in promoting that welfare, as not a building had then been fully completed, and only small sums had been used for other purposes of that character.

It is unfortunate and regrettable that the discontent and the discomfort of the men, with all of the direful consequences resulting therefrom, and especially "that craving for drink which results in no small part from the monotony of barrack life that slowly breeds discontent, no matter how comfortably housed or well-fed the men may be," should be unnecessarily prolonged, when the means for its alleviation have been so liberally provided and have been lying idle so long. When the last item upon the *menu* for a Thanksgiving dinner for the soldiers at the Columbus Barracks, Ohio, November 26th, 1902, was "one quart of beer for each soldier," it would not appear that, from a social point of view, any very vigorous effort was being made by the officers to restrain the indulgence in beer and encourage total abstinence. This is not the only instance of the kind.

I do not say whether the administration of this legislation is in the hands of its friends or otherwise, nor do I characterize the attitude of the Department. Upon its record of calling for statistics within three days of the passage of the law, when statistics must have been expected to be unfavorable in the absence of proper conditions, its contemptuous refusal of the Buzzacott proposition, its collection and gratuitous presentation of only such newspaper reports as were adverse to the legislation, and its failure promptly to utilize the appropriation that was to take the place of the beer profits, a fair-minded, disinterested, intelligent and patriotic people can judge for themselves as to its attitude.

In the light of all these facts, how much foundation is there for Colonel Church's assertion, that "the advocates of total abstinence say, in effect, that, if there is any man in the Army who refuses to accept theories that are rejected by the vast majority of men in this and every other civilized country, and who

will drink, he should be permitted to go to the devil, and the shorter the road and the faster the pace, the better." If we may be permitted to use the Colonel's choice and delicate language, we may ask, Who is it, in the light of the foregoing facts, that is keeping the obstructions out of the soldiers way "to the devil," shortening the road and accelerating the pace? The Colonel seems gratified to feel that he is with the "vast majority," laboring under the impression, evidently, that facts are settled that way. This is calculated to disconcert the "Big Four" and other railroads, to make them realize that when, in order to secure keen, alert, clear-minded and efficient men, they promulgate an order that their employees must not drink intoxicating liquors at all, whether on or off duty, they are in the minority in a "civilized country." If such a course will secure better men for railroading, it may be worthy of consideration whether it would not work as well in other cases. Do we need, especially in time of war, as good men for officers and men, from the standpoint of efficiency, as the railroads find they need in their business? If so, should we not make reasonable efforts to get them? King Edward evidently did not realize how lonesome he would be, when, in a recent letter to an officer of the Navy, this sentence was inserted: "His Majesty would be glad if it is circulated privately, that he considers his health is as much honored by those who drink it in water as by those who drink it in wine," an insidious and really reprehensible incentive to that vulgar and degrading, and rather uncommon, habit of total abstinence. Let us hope that the adverse sentiment of our noble Army, voiced so mildly by Colonel Church, may be broken to His Majesty gently and by degrees. Notwithstanding the Colonel's fervor, temperance is now being officially taught in the French and British, and encouraged in the German and Russian armies. A temperance society is one of the established institutions of the British Army. H. R. H. the Duke of Cambridge was its patron General; H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught is its President, and Field-Marshal Lord Wolseley is its First Vice-President. The flower of the officers of that Army take pride in identifying themselves with it, and the government contributes handsomely for its financial support. We are either not far enough or too far advanced for such an institution in our Army. We think this legislation is in line with the most advanced thought, even if it may be in the minority.

That a Post Exchange, with proper provisions for recreation, amusement and entertainment and supplies for the men, and a company fund are essential to the success of this legislation, is, we think, clear. Its friends, and especially the Rev. E. C. Dinwiddie and Mrs. Margaret Dye Ellis, the able, faithful, efficient and untiring legislative representatives, respectively, of the American Anti-Saloon League and the W. C. T. U. at Washington, have been doing their best to procure and have utilized the necessary appropriations therefor. Instead of compelling the soldier to rely upon the profits of a beer saloon, whose sole customer he is, for furnishing him with the things essential to his welfare, we think he has a right to look to the people, by whom he has been placed in a condition where these things have become essential.

We think we are entitled, upon the facts, to ask the country to believe that we are inspired by a sincere desire to promote the highest welfare of the Army, rather than by a narrow purpose to enforce upon the officers and men any personal views we may entertain. And as the officers are as a rule high-minded, honorable gentlemen, we believe that, when they fully appreciate the situation, they will credit us with that desire.

For the beer saloon we substitute the Treasury of the United States. In the effort to make this substitution, we believe we have the sympathy and support of all right-thinking citizens, and that we ought to have the hearty cooperation of the War Department and the officers of the Army. We sincerely believe and earnestly hope that the substitution will prove a perfect success; but when it shall have been made, and shall have had a fair trial under such favorable conditions as are herein mentioned, if it shall prove to affect injuriously the condition of our soldiers, we will cheerfully join in a movement to reestablish the beer saloon. There is practically an agreement that the sale of beer is at least the lesser of two evils. Every report that has been made, every opinion that has been expressed, every resolution that has been adopted, has been made, expressed and adopted in the absence of conditions that all believe desirable, and that we believe essential. Should not judgment be suspended until these conditions have been created, and until they have had time to demonstrate their utility and wisdom? Would not a reversal of this legislation before that time be ill-considered, ill-advised and unwarranted?

C. E. LITTLEFIELD.

AUSTRALIA'S SECOND PARLIAMENT.

BY HUGH H. LUSK.

THE elections that have been recently concluded for the second Parliament of Australia have developed features of far more than local interest. There were many reasons why this was likely to be the case, some of them local, and others connected with the questions at present occupying so largely the attention of both the Mother Country and her greater colonies. Among the more local questions the chief was, beyond all doubt, what is known in Australia as "the Labor Question." Among the more general questions, Protection and Free Trade, mainly in their bearing on the policy advocated by Mr. Chamberlain, and the attitude the colony should take up on that policy, overshadowed every other issue. Other questions, of less moment, were found in the effect produced by the grant of equal electoral privileges to women, and by the attempts made, in a good many localities, on the part of the women to take full advantage of the concession, by offering themselves as candidates for election both to the Senate and to the Representative Chamber of the Federal Legislature.

The general result of the elections was wholly unexpected by any one. The first Federal Parliament contained three parties, it is true; but the Government, which stood for protection, and the Opposition, which stood for a tariff for revenue only, formed an overwhelming majority of its members. In the Representative Chamber, the party of protection was considerably the stronger, indeed it gave the Government a fair working majority of fourteen votes over the Opposition: in the Senate, however, the Government and Opposition parties were almost exactly balanced, and the three Labor members gave the preponderance now to one side and now to the other. The skill in Parliamentary management, and certainly the debating power, in both Chambers lay

with the Opposition; and while the vacillation of the Barton Cabinet on many subjects did not actually lead to defeat in the House, it certainly left a strong impression on the mind of the country that the days of the Cabinet would be numbered as soon as the appeal to the constituencies came. The general opinion of all parties was, that the Free Trade party would come back with a majority sufficient to enable it to overturn the Cabinet, and to modify the protectionist tariff which had been enacted. The result of the elections has been to disappoint all expectations.

What has happened has been a victory for the Labor party, throughout the Commonwealth, such as leaves the position of both Government and Opposition difficult, and almost ridiculous. Of the thirty-six members constituting the Senate, there are now only eight who are pronounced protectionists and supporters of the Government. There are fourteen members representing the Opposition party, and the same number who belong to the party of Labor, so that either of those parties can command nearly double as many votes as the Ministry of the day. In the House, the position is almost equally embarrassing. The Government, or Protectionist party, has secured twenty-six seats out of seventy-six; while the Opposition has twenty-seven, and the party of Labor twenty-three. The present Ministry, therefore, stands in a minority in each of the Chambers. Should it ever happen—as in certain exceptional circumstances it might, under the terms of the Constitution—that the members of both Chambers sat and voted together, the Opposition could command forty-one votes, the Labor party thirty-seven, and the Government only thirty-four.

The situation, as will be readily understood, is an embarrassing one to both Government and Opposition. By all the rules which in England have governed Parliamentary responsible government, the Cabinet should at once resign and lay down the task which it has no longer the power to carry out. Should the Cabinet resign to-morrow, however, the Opposition would find itself almost equally powerless to carry on the government, without relying on the support of members whose allegiance is due to one or other of the parties disagreeing with their general policy. It is, of course, equally clear that the Labor party could not undertake the task with even the smallest hope of success; so that the result would seem to be something very like a deadlock.

Only two courses would seem to be open to the present Cabinet. One, and certainly the one most accordant with precedent, would be that of resigning office, as it is clear from the result of the elections that it has not the confidence of a majority of the constituents. The other course, for which in the peculiar circumstances of the case many excuses may be found, would be to endeavor to make an alliance, more or less formal, with the Labor party by which some at least of the measures of that party may be passed, and the Cabinet guaranteed against defeat in a want-of-confidence motion, should one be moved by the Opposition. The objections to this way of meeting the crisis are many, it is true; and yet there would seem to be little doubt that it is the course most likely to commend itself to Mr. Deakin's Cabinet. The leading objection is, that any such alliance could only be secured at a price, and that price one which would lend more or less sanction to views which are almost openly socialistic in their tendency. More than once in the last session of the last Parliament, the Government was saved from defeat by the help of the Labor party, then much less powerful than now; and in every case the assistance was followed by some concession of an important kind to the wishes of the Labor leaders. It cannot be doubted that now, holding, as they do, the key of the political situation in their hands, the terms of any such assistance would be very much more stringent and far-reaching.

It may be urged, and indeed it is already urged by that portion of the press which supports the Government and its protectionist policy, that the Deakin Cabinet, being in office, and seeing clearly that no single party in the Federal Parliament, as now constituted, can command a majority except by some compromise of this kind, is only doing its duty to the Commonwealth by retaining office on these terms. The answer of the Opposition is, that in case of a resignation, it would be for the Opposition, if anybody, to make such a compromise, which that party could do the more easily because the alternative could be made a dissolution of the newly elected Parliament, so far as the Representative Chamber is concerned—an alternative clearly not at the disposal of the Cabinet in office. There can be little doubt, indeed, that if it must come to a bargain between the Government in office and the party of Labor, a Cabinet formed by the present Opposition would have a very great advantage over any other. The difference

in strength—except, of course, in the Senate—between the parties is almost nominal; but, in the possession of the power to send back the newly elected representatives to their constituencies for re-election, the Opposition would hold a very strong card indeed; one which would count for much with the Labor members.

The causes that have led to the present position of affairs throughout the States of the Commonwealth are somewhat peculiar. Three months ago, those who were supposed to be best informed on the subject were prepared to prophesy a great defeat at the polls for the Government and its policy of high protection, and all the indications seemed to favor the idea that the Free Trade party in Opposition would be the party to profit by the change of public opinion. The result of the election has shown a defeat for the Government, and by implication for its policy, but the Opposition has not been the chief beneficiary. The principal reason of this unexpected result has been—though this is not generally appreciated, even in Australia, as yet—the fiscal agitation set on foot by Mr. Chamberlain. That gave Mr. Deakin his opportunity for turning the flank of the Opposition—an opportunity which he seized and made the most of. Before the last session of the late Parliament expired, he was able to announce a policy for the protectionist party which fell in with what were understood to be Mr. Chamberlain's views, without interfering with the fiscal settlement arrived at as the result of nearly a year of struggle in the first session. The plan which he outlined was, in effect, the same as that carried through the New Zealand Parliament, except that it went a good deal farther, and applied to a very much larger number of classes of goods than were affected in New Zealand. In promising to bring in a measure to carry out this policy in case his party was returned with a majority at the election, he arrayed behind him not only the protectionists of Victoria on whom he mainly relied, but the large body of voters throughout all the States who are influenced by a strong sentiment of Imperialism. He also placed the Free Trade Opposition in the difficult position of appearing to oppose any suggestion of falling in with a policy of preference for commercial purposes within the Empire. The leader of the Opposition, indeed, declared his readiness to support a system of favored-nation treatment for the Mother Country, as long as it took the shape of reducing duties now imposed on British, in common with foreign, goods, and not

of adding duties in the case of foreign-made ones. The answer was not a success, because it was easily made to appear to be a trick which professed to do something for English interests which it neither would nor could do. The experience of many months of struggle, during which trade was disorganized owing to doubts respecting the shape which the Federal tariff was likely to take, has made the majority of Australians shrink from a reopening of the question, and the Government proposals seemed to avoid this.

In this sense, and to this extent, the contest now going on in England was a serious factor in the Commonwealth elections just concluded. The name of Mr. Chamberlain, more than that of any other English statesman of the day, is a name to conjure with in Australasia; and any proposals advocated by him are at present certain of large support from Australian voters. When to this was added the sentiment aroused in favor of Imperialism by the events of the last three years, it is not wonderful that very many voters shrank from taking an active part in the elections that might tend to defeat the plans of so popular a man as the former Secretary for the Colonies, and to strike a serious blow at the inter-State preferential trade of which he is the advocate. There is no other possible way of accounting for the disappointment which has attended the Free Trade party in New South Wales, which is, as it always has been, the headquarters of the faith in Australia; and what is true of the Mother Colony of the group is true in its degree of all the other States. The evidence that such was the case may be found in the fact that, had the party of Free Trade polled anything like its full strength in New South Wales, it would have swept the State, and returned to the Representative Chamber certainly not less than twenty-three out of the twenty-seven members it sends to the Federal Parliament. Instead of doing this, it only succeeded in returning sixteen, the balance of seven going to the party of Labor. The same result, or very nearly the same, was reached in each of the States, with the single exception of Victoria, where the protectionist policy is naturally in the ascendant. In every instance, the Free Trade candidates received much less support than was expected.

The party which has profited by this peculiar effect of Mr. Chamberlain's great fiscal agitation has not been, however, the party in office, but the party of Labor. The result of the dissatisfaction of Free-Traders with the attitude of their leaders on

the question of Imperial Preference did not take the form of making them vote for Labor candidates, but it did keep them from voting at all, with the result that many of the seats were obtained by candidates who were unable to poll more than a fourth part of the electors on the rolls. It may be said, indeed, that the party has succeeded best which best deserved success, because it was the one which worked for success most intelligently and enthusiastically. While the Government party was much discredited by its weak administration during its two years of office, and the Opposition was out of touch with the prevailing sentiment of the community by its thinly veiled opposition to preferential trade within the Empire, the party of Labor suffered from no drawback in either direction. In its manipulation of the Cabinet in power, it had been very successful, having secured many concessions in favor of its own views, especially in the direction of exemptions from duties likely to affect the workers, and in this it had both consolidated its own ranks and gained the respect of others. Its strongest point, however, was that it had made no pronouncement on the subject of preferential trade, so that any candidate from its ranks was at liberty to give an entire assent to the views of Mr. Chamberlain. Many, indeed most of them, did so; and it is far from unlikely that in this way they disarmed the opposition of not a few Free-Traders, even if they did not actually gain their support.

The elections were the first to test the effect of the new law which gave the same electoral rights to both sexes for all Federal purposes. Women had, indeed, voted at the elections for the first Parliament in South Australia, owing to the fact that they already possessed the franchise in that State according to the old colonial law; but the population is not large, and the circumstances made it difficult to form an estimate as to the general effect of the law. At the recent elections the privilege was enjoyed by women in all the States; and, owing to its novelty, the effects were closely observed. Two things may be said to stand out as results: one, that the tendency is for the female electors to take an active part in the contest; the other, that they usually voted very much on the same lines as their male relations, and so produced no marked change in the position of parties. If there is any definite change in this respect, it is that the women's vote seems rather to have strengthened the hands of the Labor party. This can be

readily understood from the fact, that every one of the planks laid down in the Labor platform aimed at a direct and practical economic advantage for the working classes, and therefore seemed to hold out a promise of betterment to all who belong to those classes. The same cannot, of course, be said—at any rate, with anything like the same certainty—of the principles of either Protection or Free Trade. If these are not too much in the nature of theoretical reasonings to appeal to the average feminine mind, it may be said truly that they appeal less directly to it, and with much less force. As a matter of fact, it was found that the wives and daughters of the workers were hardly, if at all, less enthusiastic politicians than their husbands and fathers, and could be relied on to vote, and to urge others to vote, while the female voters of other classes were largely conspicuous by their absence from the polls, or for their apparent indifference to the results arrived at.

Unlike New Zealand, the Commonwealth has given its women, not only the full right of voting, but also of holding a seat in either Chamber of the Federal Legislature, and there were not wanting ladies who were ambitious to take advantage of the new privilege. In nearly all the States, there were female candidates for seats in the Representative Chamber; and in two, at least, women courted election as Senators to represent the whole State. The attempt seems to have been a little in advance of public sentiment. For the Senate, neither of the female candidates took even a respectable place at the polls; and, even in the case of the House, they were easily beaten by nearly all their male competitors. The fact that in no case whatever was any female candidate selected by any one of the three parties among whom the public was divided, may account for this apparently rather ungallant result. The course of New Zealand, whose example has been closely followed in many respects of late years in the legislation of Australia, has been far more cautious and conservative in this respect; and it appears likely that, after all, it will result more satisfactorily, even from the standpoint of feminine political ambition. In the island colony, the franchise was granted to women ten years ago, but the right to be elected to seats in the Legislature was withheld. After ten years' experience, if the women voters of New Zealand really wished the further privilege of becoming legislators in their own persons, it is certain they

could have the law altered without difficulty. Were such a change made, it may be looked on as a certainty that there would be little or no prejudice in New Zealand against the idea of female candidates, and some, at least, would be sure of election.

The general result of the elections must, as has already been said, be considered a great victory for the party of Labor. That victory, however, is not likely to lead to any immediately sensational changes either in legislation or in administration. An alliance between the present Cabinet and the leaders of the Labor party is more than probable; but it will not take the form to any extent of a coalition. The Government will still propound its own policy; and, so far as it deals with such questions as preference for British goods, it will obtain enough support from Labor members to carry it through, at least in its general features. The alliance will be sufficiently strong to keep the Free Trade party out of office and the Protectionist minority in office, and the price will be the acceptance by the Cabinet of two or three of the planks of the Labor platform as measures of its own. Most of the planks in the Labor platform, it is true, are subjects for State rather than Federal legislation; but some—such as an Act to prevent monopolies, a national system of irrigation, embracing the vesting of the frontages in the Federal Government instead of the States, and the establishment of a National Bank—seem to be within its reach, and may be the first steps in an effort destined to carry the Commonwealth far on the road to State socialism. One thing would appear almost certain from the indications of the elections for Australia's second Parliament: this is, that the party of Labor is for the present the coming party. If its leaders are wise and moderate in this Parliament, the chances are that they will enter the next with so large a following as would justify them in making a bid for office. What they will want most, in that case, is a man to lead them. With a leader as able and adroit as the Premier of New Zealand has proved himself during ten years of office, the way is open in the Commonwealth for experiments in social legislation more radical than any attempted in New Zealand by Mr. Seddon and his party.

HUGH H. LUSK.

HOW THE UNITED STATES CURTAILS FREEDOM OF THOUGHT.

BY ERNEST CROSBY.

As I write these lines, a British subject is occupying a narrow cell, a veritable cage of steel bars, on Ellis Island in New York Harbor. Two guards watch him constantly and accompany him during his hours of exercise. He is forbidden to receive visitors or speak to strangers, and he can only consult his counsel in the presence of his jailers. He is, in short, treated like a convicted felon; but, as a matter of fact, he is not a felon. He came to this country on his own legitimate business, a few months ago; and, during the weeks which he was allowed to spend at large, he carefully observed our laws and customs. He is a man of some standing at home, for he is an "organizer" of the "National Amalgamated Union of Shop Assistants, Warehousemen and Clerks," a society which counts, I believe, many thousands of members. But, notwithstanding his altogether respectable behavior and position in society, he was suddenly arrested in New York by agents of the Federal Department of Commerce and Labor, and hurried away to his cell. No regular court intervened and there was no judicial process involved, but the whole matter was managed by the Secretary of Commerce and his subordinates. The Habeas Corpus proceeding, which was dismissed by Judge Lacombe, from whose decision the prisoner has appealed, can only touch the question of the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce and the constitutionality of the act under which it is acting. It cannot in any way review the order of the Secretary nor correct his errors of fact or law, for this important official alone has to be "satisfied" of the facts, and it is his duty to enforce the law "under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe." He is thus constituted policeman, prosecuting officer, judge, jury and

executioner, and from his decision no appeal lies. This kind of procedure recalls the English "Star Chamber." In Russia, it is known as "administrative process," and it has become notorious under that name; and it was called "*lettre de cachet*" in France before the fall of the Bastille. Some of us have fondly supposed that in America, at least, it was altogether foreign and obsolete.

The charge made against Mr. John Turner is, that he is an alien unlawfully in the United States, in that he is an "anarchist" within the meaning of the act of Congress of March 3rd, 1903, entitled "An Act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States." Section 2 of this act provides that, among others, the following aliens shall be excluded from admission to our shores, namely, "anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials." It might be supposed that the latter part of this clause was intended as a definition of what an "anarchist" really is; but Section 38 of the same act destroys this presumption, by explicitly excluding from the country any person "who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all government." It thus appears that the ban falls upon all disbelievers in government, as well as upon those who advocate the use of violence in realizing their disbeliefs.

What then is an "anarchist," within the meaning of this highly stringent law? The full definition of the word is given as follows in the "Century Dictionary":

"Anarchist, (1) properly, one who advocates anarchy or the absence of government as a political ideal; a believer in an anarchic theory of society, especially an adherent of the social theory of Proudhon; (2) in popular use, one who seeks to overturn by violence all constituted forms and institutions of society and government, all law and order, and all rights of property, with no purpose of establishing any other system of order in the place of that destroyed; especially, such a person when actuated by mere lust of plunder; (3) any person who promotes disorder or excites revolt against an established rule, law or custom."

It appears from the above definition that it is only in "popular use" that the term "anarchist" has any connection with violence, and that, "properly," it signifies merely a man who cherishes a

certain political ideal. This position is sustained by Professor Huxley, who writes as follows in his "Essay on Government":

"Anarchy, as a term of political philosophy, must be taken only in its proper sense, which has nothing to do with disorder or with crimes; but denotes a state of society, in which the rule of each individual by himself is the only government the legitimacy of which is recognized. Anarchy, as thus far defined, is the logical outcome of the form of political theory which for the last half-century and more has been known under the name of Individualism."

A comparison of these "proper" and "popular" definitions shows that the word "anarchist" may mean several distinct things, and that it is, consequently, a very vague word to be thus used for the first time in a statute without any attempt at precise definition. But let us suppose that it was intended to deport any kind of an anarchist, within the meaning of any of the definitions, and let us see where the supposition will lead us.

The best known anarchist of the day is Prince Peter Kropotkin, one of the most distinguished of living men of science, and shown by his own autobiography (though unconsciously and with all modesty) to be one of the noblest and most self-sacrificing of philanthropists. Next to him in fame comes the French anarchist, Elisée Réclus, the first of contemporary geographers, and a man so tender-hearted that he has written one of the strongest appeals against the slaughter of animals for food, from the standpoint of humanitarianism. England offers an asylum to one of these men and treats him with honor, while the other lives peaceably in Belgium; but the American Republic shuts them out. Henrik Ibsen, one of the glories of Scandinavia, and the foremost dramatist of the time, must be included with these men. In a letter to Georg Brandes, the Danish critic, he writes:

"The State is the curse of the individual. . . . Away with the State! I will take part in that revolution. Undermine the whole conception of a State, declare free choice and spiritual kinship to be the only all-important conditions of any union, and you will have the commencement of a liberty that is worth something."

Count Leo Tolstoy, of course, shares these views to the uttermost, and it is unnecessary to quote from the numerous passages in which he condemns government, root and branch. He claims for himself the title of Christian, and it is the opinion of many

that he approaches more nearly to the Master in his life than other professing Christians. However this may be, the term "Christian anarchist" is not uncommon, and no less an authority than Renan seems to justify it in his "Life of Jesus." He says:

"In one view, Jesus was an anarchist, for he had no notion of civil government, which seemed to him an abuse, pure and simple. . . . Every magistrate seems to him a natural enemy of the people of God. . . . His aim is to annihilate wealth and power, not to grasp them."

It is not necessary to agree with Renan in his judgment for the purposes of my argument. He was certainly a man of great mental powers, and if he held to-day the position of Secretary of Commerce in our government and Jesus Christ came to our shores, he would be obliged, by the law and his estimate of the facts, to deport the Founder of Christianity in sight of a hundred spires erected in His name.

It would be easy to quote from other foreign teachers and writers,—from Herbert Spencer, for instance, whom the world is now mourning as perhaps the greatest of modern thinkers, and who said: "We cannot choose but admit the right of the citizen to adopt a condition of voluntary outlawry," and much more to the same effect; from Lamennais, from Guizot, from Wilhelm von Humboldt and others (including Proudhon himself, who is named by the "Century Dictionary" as the founder of anarchism and is described, in a laudatory article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" as "one of the most remarkable figures of modern France," devoted to the "moral ideas" of "justice, liberty and equality")—to prove that anarchism has found a place in the dreams of the highest authorities abroad; but let us turn to our own country. This Act of March 3rd, 1903, while not aimed at American citizens principally, brings them in incidentally; for Section 38 provides a fine of not more than five thousand dollars, or imprisonment for not less than one nor more than five years, or both, for any person who invites a foreign "anarchist" to enter the country or assists him so to do. In principle, indeed, there is no reason why we should discriminate between foreign and domestic thinkers; and, if anything, the latter, by reason of their knowledge of the temper of the country, are the more dangerous. The Constitution may stand in the way of attacking native an-

archists for their beliefs, but it can be circumvented by interpretation; and, besides, constitutions are subject to amendment. Doubtless, the possibility of the deportation of visitors on account of their beliefs or disbeliefs never presented itself to the framers of that instrument, or they would have considered the free thought of foreigners at least as sacred as the free speech of citizens, and this latter they were careful to guard. Let us suppose that the Act of March 3rd extended to citizens, and let us examine the opinions of some of our own illustrious dead, and determine if anarchism is, as men usually suppose, a foreign article which can be stopped at the frontier.

William Lloyd Garrison is one of the heroes of the conflict with slavery,—I should be inclined to say the chief hero,—and his statue stands to-day in the streets of Boston, the mark of the esteem in which we hold his memory. He anticipated to the full, over sixty years ago, Count Tolstoy's views of the immorality of government by force. At the Peace Convention, held at Boston, in 1838, he drew up a "Declaration of Sentiments," which was adopted, and which he regarded as more important than the Declaration of Independence. The spirit of disbelief in government pervades this paper, from which I quote the following:

"As every human government is upheld by physical strength and its laws are enforced virtually at the point of the bayonet, we cannot hold any office which imposes upon its incumbent the obligation to compel men to do right on pain of imprisonment or death. We therefore exclude ourselves voluntarily from every legislative and judicial body, and repudiate all human politics, worldly honors and stations of authority."

This declaration combines with its anarchism the loftiest Christian sentiments. If Garrison were living to-day, and a foreigner of less than three years' standing in this country, he would have to be deported. The case against Thoreau is even clearer, for he dares to say:

"That government is best which governs not at all, and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have."

Thoreau must get into the prison-van alongside of Garrison. And here is another American whose language points in the same direction:

"I am glad to see that the terror at disunion and anarchy is disappearing. Massachusetts, in its heroic days, had no government, was an anarchy. Every man stood on his own feet, was his own governor, and there was no breach of peace from Cape Cod to Mount Hoosac."

These are the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson, taken from an address on "Affairs in Kansas," delivered at Cambridge in 1856. Let them move up and make place for Emerson in the Secretary's "Black Maria!" And now an illustrious statesman must join this distinguished group of exiles,—no less a man than the author of the Declaration of Independence, and the third President of the United States. It was Thomas Jefferson who wrote:

"Were it made a question, whether no law, as among the savage Americans, or too much law, as among the civilized Europeans, submits man to the greater evil, one who has seen both conditions of existence would pronounce it to be the last."

And again:

"Societies exist under three forms sufficiently distinguishable. (1) Without government, as among our Indians; (2) under government where the will of every one has a just influence. . . . (3) under governments of force. . . . It is a problem not clear in my mind that the first condition is not the best."

He considers that condition, however, impossible for a large population.

Surely, the language of all of these great Americans "advocates the absence of government," or at least goes to prove that the speaker was an advocate of it in his thoughts. Logically, they must be excluded from the Land of Freedom.

But even those who advocate government are not always respectful to the principle. Mr. Charles Nordhoff may fairly be taken as an exponent of the popular idea of government, for his "Politics for Young Americans" is the recognized handbook on the subject in our schools. Here is his teaching:

"Governments are necessary evils. Their necessity arises out of the selfishness and stupidity of mankind."

It is quite possible, then, that the anarchist, who "advocates the absence of government as a political ideal," agrees with the orthodox school in everything except the "necessity" of an admitted evil, or, in other words, hopes for the final overthrow of

human "selfishness and stupidity." This may be foolish, but it is hardly a crime. Should we deport men for their optimism? And it is a fact, as Mr. Jefferson suggests when he refers to the Indians, that many of our fellow men have lived happily without government. Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace writes thus in his "Malay Archipelago":

"I have lived with communities of savages, in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law-courts but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellows, and any infraction of those rights rarely or never takes place. In such a community, all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions, of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant, which are the product of our civilization. There is none of that widespread division of labor, which, while it increases wealth, produces also conflicting interests; there is not that severe competition and struggle for existence or for wealth which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitements to great crimes are thus wanting, and petty ones are suppressed, partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that sense of justice and his neighbors' rights which seems to be in some degree inherent in every race of men."

It may be an idle dream to hope to combine the advantages of barbarism and civilization, but it cannot be a sin, and the dreamer need not be a public enemy; for among such dreamers have been found the saviors and leaders of the race.

Still, it is true that awful crimes have been committed in the name of this belief. But cannot crimes be committed in any cause? The massacre of Saint Bartholomew, the tortures and *auto-da-fes* of the Inquisition, were committed in the name of Christianity, and with the honest intention of furthering the interests of the religion of love to God and neighbor. The Reign of Terror was inaugurated on behalf of fraternity, and the Crucifixion was ordered in the name of religion and morality. Are we for this reason to condemn Christianity and fraternity and morality? Should we not rather draw a sharp line between a man's beliefs and the method which he adopts to realize them? Here, again, we must make a distinction. A man may in the abstract "believe in the overthrow by force or violence" of governments, without being in the slightest degree a dangerous character. Most Americans who travel in Russia or Turkey would be delighted to have the tyranny of Tzar or Sultan upset by force; but

we are permitted, none the less, to enter those countries, and it would be considered barbarous to require from us a declaration that we "believed in," or rather that we "did not disbelieve in," their peculiar governmental systems. All men, except non-resistants of the Tolstoyan type (who are anarchists within the definition of the "Century Dictionary"), believe in the right of revolution when government becomes unbearable, and no forum has ever been established for the determination of the proper minimum point of insupportability except the individual conscience of the rebel and the jury of posterity.

It is a mistake, then, to attack a man's beliefs or disbeliefs in this, that or any kind of government, and also his abstract belief or disbelief in the right of revolution. The crime which our legislators had before their minds was the definite and distinct crime of assassination of rulers. The men whom they wished to exclude were those who preach or practise assassination. Why, then, did they not say so in so many words? It might still be a question of expediency whether it would not be wiser to admit even such men, as England does, and to restrict our action to crimes committed or advocated on our own territory, for by this policy England has escaped all anarchistic crime. But there would be nothing shocking to the moral sense in excluding men who preach assassination, as there certainly is in shutting out mere idealists. To confuse the crime of method with the mental ideal of the criminal, is a stupid error against which all the lessons of history rise in protest, and for the descendants of Puritans, Quakers, Huguenots, Baptists, Jews and democrats, who came to America for the express purpose of believing what they pleased, to turn about now and shut out others on account of their beliefs is an astounding performance.

Apart from the folly and injustice of attacking abstract beliefs, there is also the insuperable difficulty of proof. What does a man believe? Half the time he does not himself know, and if he is endowed with an active mind he is likely to change his beliefs from year to year. Then, too, he will be tempted to lie about them to escape punishment, and the exasperation caused to the authorities by his apparent wilful refusal to tell the truth about a matter known only to himself, will before long bring the rack and thumb-screw into use again, in some form, perhaps, less crude, but none the less barbarous. Our army has become proficient in

the torture of the water-cure, and at home the "sweat-box" and dark cell have been used to the same purpose. When beliefs become the legitimate field of juridical investigation, these methods will have to be practised, for there are no other adequate methods of probing a man's mind. We bought the Philippine Islands for twenty million dollars. Is it possible that the Holy Spanish Inquisition was thrown in into the bargain? But, besides inviting torture, the opening of the door to proof of beliefs gives new and unequalled opportunities to the spy and informer. How can I disprove a belief attributed to me by a professional liar? Deportation can be ordered under the Act of March 3rd, 1903, during three years after the arrival of the immigrant. What a field for blackmail is thus provided! The young farmer has set up his home in the West and sown his second crop. He and his wife and children are busy learning to become good American citizens, when suddenly the informer drops upon them, and brings up some chance word, dropped, perhaps, by the immigrant on the steamer which brought him over,—a word possibly misunderstood, misconstrued, wrested from its true meaning, or even invented and made out of whole cloth,—and he must pay hush-money to the spy or be sent back to his old home, his hopes wrecked forever.

It is a fact that an unusual number of atrocious crimes against the persons of kings and rulers have been committed in recent years, and that many of them were committed by anarchists. Not all, however, by any means. Such crimes have been most frequent in Russia, and there the assailants have usually been merely democrats or constitutionalists. In England, these crimes have been confined to Irish nationalists, whose only political creed was separation from England. In the United States, three Presidents have been assassinated—the first by a Democrat and Confederate, the second by a Republican, and the third only by an anarchist. Each of these assassins was an American born, and educated in our schools,—a fact which might induce us to judge more leniently of foreign immigrants. But, after making allowance for the many crimes of this nature attributable to non-anarchists, there remain a number of peculiarly shocking ones committed by adherents of anarchism. It becomes, then, a matter of importance to determine how best to prevent such crimes in future. To shut out "beliefs" is not only unjust, undesirable and inexpedient, but it is impossible. Beliefs spring up uncen-

sored and uncensorable in the mind of every one of our eighty millions of population, and most Americans do not arrive by way of Ellis Island. Booth and Guiteau and Czolgosz were native products, and could not be deported whence they came. Then, again, beliefs travel by mail more effectively than by steerage, and unless you examine every letter, book and newspaper that enters our ports, you cannot shut out the beliefs which they express. You may, however, by passing rigid statutes against idealists, tempt cranks who sympathize with them to perform some overt act of violence, for nothing makes a class so dangerous as to proscribe it. The large meeting held at Cooper Union in New York to protest against the deportation of Turner has been widely criticised as tending to encourage violence. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The deportation itself was calculated to suggest violence in reprisal, but the establishment of the fact that there were a considerable number of "respectable" citizens ready to consider the wrongs even of anarchists,—nothing, surely, could do more than that to restore to an equilibrium the unbalanced minds of some members of that fraternity.

We are face to face with a peculiar symptom of an obscure public distemper, and it cannot be cured by such crude methods as deportation. The subject calls for the most careful study of statesmen, penologists, economists and educators. What is it that produces crimes against rulers? We seem to understand the matter clearly in Russia, and there we ascribe the trouble directly to the governing class. Abolish autocracy and absolutism, we say, and say rightly, and the revolutionist's bomb will disappear. In Ireland, we have no great difficulty in forming a diagnosis either. England has misruled that country for centuries, we declare, and she has only reaped what she has sown. Here, again, we trace the disorder back to a national wrong. What was the cause of the three American assassinations? Booth's crime was clearly one of the results of the Civil War. It was the war-spirit, which we took no pains to exorcise, that turned him into a murderer. Guiteau was an extreme expression of political strife and hatred, the direct offspring of Stalwart and Half-Breed rivalry. Czolgosz was no less truly the product of his times. The war-spirit was abroad again. Revenge had been preached as a public virtue, and war deliberately chosen by the nation in preference to diplomacy as the proper instrument of progress. Again the awful crimes of

individuals seem to hark back to a national cause; they are sporadic expressions of a general infection. And our rulers are preaching the same doctrines in our name to-day, and, so far as we support them, we are responsible for the results. A government which assassinates one sister-republic in the Philippines and vivisects another in South America, which bombards defenceless villages in Samoa, killing women and children, in a cause afterwards pronounced by an impartial tribunal to be absolutely unjust, such a government is setting an example of anarchy in the worst sense of the word.

Political crimes, then, appear in some way to arise from national pathological conditions; they are exhibitions of individual lunacy growing out of a popular craze. The anarchist assassin is, to all intents and purposes, insane, and he is doing all he can to injure his own cause. Longing for a world good enough to dispense with policemen, prisons and electric chairs, he does his best to prove by his act the impracticability of his dream. It is really Czolgosz who is shutting Turner out of America, and if he had been in control of his senses he might have foreseen the consequences of his act, by which he made government stronger and discredited his own beliefs. His act was an insane one, but no man can be insane alone, for none of us lives to himself, and every man is, and must be, a social symptom. There is a public madness of the war-spirit, a delirium of national pride and power, a general fever of money-getting, which in some peculiarly distorted mind may take the form of unreasoning revolt against all these things. The strenuous life has many shapes, and it may be practised by devils as well as angels.

If there is any truth in this reasoning, the proper cure for criminal anarchism lies in the direction of the cultivation of national sanity. The European countries which produce the greatest number of assassins are military-mad. They are busy pauperizing themselves and exhausting the healthy blood of their people in the insane rivalry of armaments. The Italian statesman who would send three-fourths of the army back to their homes and sink nine-tenths of their men-of-war in the Mediterranean, would go a long way toward stopping the production of political criminals. Our national disease shows the greatest congestion and inflammation in the region of the dollar. The mad race to increase wealth beyond all possibility of enjoyment, the crazy antics of

the Stock Exchange,—we must study these things, before we can prescribe for the nation. Our lunatic asylums are ever growing; more and more men and women commit suicide each year; nervous prostration is becoming the rule rather than the exception. How far is the dollar-cult responsible for all this? Excessive wealth must find an outlet for investment, and hence the craving for the isles of the sea, and for armies and navies and bloodshed; and who can wonder if here and there a distracted individual goes off, like a stray revolver, the wrong way, and kills a fellow citizen instead of a foreign foe?

The anarchist will not cease to be a danger,—(one of many, many dangers),—until we set up healthy ideals in the market-place, in Wall Street and at Washington. We need not preach love for neighbor,—that is, perhaps, asking too much; but we ought to insist, at least, upon a wholesome regard for his rights. It has been suggested that we now love him too much like the traditional lover,—we love the very ground he treads upon,—which is a good enough reason for taking it from under his feet. We should respect his liberties, and, as we only need love him as ourselves, we should respect our own liberties too. It is hard to preserve liberty in a land where the money-bag is supreme and where it can count upon the mailed hand of war to carry out its behests. And yet freedom was our first love and in our younger and healthier days the love of it coursed in our veins. All liberty involves a risk, but then it is often a risk worth taking. And all repression involves risks too, and these risks are so much less noble and alluring! Freedom presupposes strength and courage, but we are becoming cowardly in our old age, and are afraid to allow men to land upon our shores who dare to “disbelieve” in our institutions or to criticise them.

It is, perhaps, unlikely that we shall soon return to our old-time devotion to freedom. So be it. But, in that case, let us stop talking about it. Let us clear ourselves of cant and cease to be hypocrites. Let us take down the beautiful statue of “Liberty Enlightening the World,” that brazen lie, which now casts its beams upon Ellis Island and its prison, and let us put up in its place an ogre of iron, grasping a gnarled and knotted club, and casting its baleful shadow upon the immigrant,—an image no longer of Liberty Enlightening, but of Despotism Darkening, the World.

ERNEST CROSBY.

THE SON OF ROYAL LANGBRITH.

BY WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS.

PART IV.

XVIII.

Mrs. LANGBRITH came out every fine day to look over her flowers at first, and then to work over them. She made the man clean up round the tall syringas planted at intervals along the brick walk to the gate, and about the lilacs that overhung the fence. She followed him as he combed down the limp last year's grass, and raked the dead leaves and stems into heaps at the points she chose, and then set fire to them. At tea, she liked to have the dining-room windows a little open, that the homely smell of their burning heaps might come in with the fresh evening air, and possess her with the dreams of that girlhood which now no longer seemed so far past. She thought Dr. Anther might stop some evening in going by; but if she caught sight of him in the distance, she went indoors. She realized that their embrace at their last meeting was more like a final parting than a pledge of union, unless she were ready to do what she wished, but was afraid, to do. Yet this thought of it had the greater sweetness for that reason; and the love that had come into her life so late was the more precious because it seemed to have come too late.

Toward her son, grown a man, she felt its indecorum in a kind which she could not quite formulate, but which was distinct enough. If her love had come when she was younger, and he still a child, it would have been different; and yet she could not blame her friend for not knowing himself sooner. That blame would have been as indecorous toward Anther as now the thought of him was toward her son. Before her marriage, her fancy had scarcely been stirred. She had gone the round of the simple children's amusements in her country neighborhood—the parties and picnics and school festivals; but no little boy had been her beau. She had not even been teased by her mates about any one. She was younger in experience than any girl she knew in the mill when Langbrith cast his eye her way, and suddenly, somehow, through her necessity and helplessness, made her his wife. She certainly was not aware of anything like love for him, so far as she imagined love; but she was flattered and

Copyright, 1903, by Harper & Brothers. All Rights Reserved.

dazzled and overcome, and she supposed that she was marrying as other people married, and for the reasons that they had. Her awakening from her illusion was like the terror of a child which has not enough knowledge of the world to match its experiences with those of others. In a fashion not definite or articulate, she accepted her lot as a common lot in wifehood; and, as she had supposed herself to have married from the usual motives, so she now supposed that what she underwent was not unusual. From her sufferings, she formed a notion of marriage grotesquely false, which was like a child's misconception of life, and the spell of this kept her submissive. She did not talk of what she underwent; no one talked to her of such things, and apparently it was not the custom.

Her childlikeness so prolonged itself, not ignorantly, but innocently, through her wifehood and motherhood and widowhood, that, when at last she was aware of liking the man who later loved her, and of trusting him and longing for his affection, it was with a sense of shame as from unprecedented guilt. Before the thought of her son she was so ashamed that she knew she should never be able to tell him of Dr. Anther, nor ever allow Anther to speak for himself. She did not feel that her tenderness for her friend could be wrong when she was with him. She was now glad of that sole embrace which they had ever suffered their love, and proud of it; but the knowledge of it sunk her at her son's feet when she imagined his knowing it. Her face burned, and it did not avail her to remember the examples of mothers that had married again, and had lived on with their husbands, and their children by their dead husbands, in unimpaired harmony and mutual respect. She was moved late in her inextinguishable girlhood to her first passion, but only to find herself inexorably consecrated to her widowhood through her reverence for her son's ideal of his father.

At sight of Hope Hawberk tilting lightly down the sidewalk, she was seized with the same impulse to flight as at the approach of the doctor in his vagarious buggy; and she had to conquer far more shyness, when, one warm afternoon, Hope caught her so pre-occupied with the hired man that it was too late for her to think of eluding her. She shrank together beyond a well-budded lilac, where Hope's gay voice, as if it had a bright entangling noose of sound, reached her in the chanted salutation, "How do you do, Mrs. Langbrith!" and held her fast. She came reluctantly from her shelter, and advanced slowly toward the gate, on the top of which the girl had laid her arms, and her red cheek for a moment in the hollow of one of them. "Isn't it awfully warm?"

"Yes, it is. Though I haven't noticed it so much, working about. Won't you come in, Hope?"

"Why, I will, Mrs. Langbrith, if you'll let me. I was just coming in, when I saw you." She pushed the gate open and joined Mrs. Langbrith, who turned with her, and walked toward the house. "How fast your things are coming on! It seems as if they were

twice as forward as ours, and there are twice as many of them. I don't suppose they help each other, do they?"

"I don't believe they do," Mrs. Langbrith answered so literally that it might have passed as a piece of the same whimsicality. "How is your grandmother?"

"She's as energetic as ever. I don't see how she can be. This weather takes all the good resolutions out of me, Mrs. Langbrith, and I don't know how I've got together enough to come and see you. I want to tell you something that I don't want to tell you."

The girl's humor was catching, and the woman caught it. "Well, what is it?" she asked, but she apparently did not expect Hope to answer till she had got her seated at an open window of the parlor, with a palm-leaf fan in her hand.

"Why, it's just this, Mrs. Langbrith. I've got into a scrape with James, and if you can't tell me how to get out of it, I don't know who can."

Mrs. Langbrith's heart fluttered with a varied anticipation, but she united her emotions in the single inexpressive phrase, "I don't believe it's anything serious."

"Yes, it is, Mrs. Langbrith. It's very serious, and it has gone so far now that something has got to be done about it, and I can't have the responsibility left to me."

Mrs. Langbrith listened with the wish for one thing and the will for another, but her will prevailed over her wish, and she kept herself from saying anything leading. She believed that there was some sort of love-quarrel which Hope had come to own, but she was not going to tempt her to the confession. She said, non-committally, "I will try not to hold you responsible."

Hope laughed rather distractedly. "I guess you will have to. It's about that tablet he wants to put up in the front of the library."

Mrs. Langbrith stiffened in her chair, and said, "Oh!"

"Well, James has been writing to me about it since he went back to Cambridge, and I guess he thinks I have been making fun of him, when I was only making fun of the notion that he should take something I said so seriously. Don't you understand?"

"James is apt to take things seriously," his mother said.

"And I'm *not*," Hope retorted with a touch of resentment, as if she felt a touch of reproach in Mrs. Langbrith's tone, though the words themselves were so neutral. "And that's just the difference, and always will be." The last clause of the sentence was a generality, which the girl seemed to address to herself rather than Mrs. Langbrith. "Now, I'll tell you what it is. He asked me what I thought about his having the dedication on Decoration Day, and I told him I didn't think it was quite fair to take that day from the old soldiers and their families; and he saw it in the same light, and he telegraphed to say that I was right and he wouldn't. And I wrote back making fun of his telegraphing, as if it couldn't wait for a letter."

"I don't see any harm in that. James is very intense in his feelings, but he would see that you didn't mean anything unfriendly—anything—"

"No, of course not. But now comes what I am really ashamed of. My making fun seems to have made him very mad, so mad that he says he is going to give up the whole idea, and won't have anything done about it. He says I have made it seem ridiculous to him."

Mrs. Langbrith cast down her eyes. "James is very sensitive in regard to—Mr. Langbrith."

"Yes, I know that, and that's what makes me sorry. Of course, I didn't mean to hurt his feelings for his father. And now, Mrs. Langbrith, and now—I've got something else to tell you. You know how girls are?"

"Thoughtless, you mean?"

"No,—*bad!* Downright wicked! I told Susie Johns about James's telegraphing. I don't see why I should do such a thing. But we were laughing about a lot of things, and that came out. It was as mean as it could be. And now I would do anything in the world to make it right, but I don't suppose I ever can. I don't care a bit about his being mad at me for it; he has a perfect right to be; but what I hate is people laughing at him. I've been to tell Susie not to tell, since I got his last letter, but I know she will. He mustn't give up the idea, because they will say that I laughed at it, and that was the reason, and I am not going to have them. Don't you see? I expect *you* to blame me, Mrs. Langbrith, and never speak to me again; but I shall not care for that if you can think of some way to stop him—to make him not give it up. Why, he *must* go on with it now. Everybody knows that he was going to do it, and he must. Was there ever such a scrape?"

Mrs. Langbrith sat silent, but this was quite what Hope seemed to expect, and the face that she turned upon the girl was by no means severe. It expressed rather, an absence of feeling, somewhat distressed and puzzled.

Hope went on. "I don't believe it will do any good for me to write to him and tell him he must?" Mrs. Langbrith made no comment on this suggestion, and Hope owned, "Well, I *have* written to him, and he's written back, and said that he knows my real feeling now, and he cannot go on. I don't see why he minds my feeling, anyway, and that's the reason why I've come to you. I don't know what made me come to you about it, but I wanted to ask you if you thought it would do for me to ask Dr. Anther to write to James?"

"Dr. Anther?"

"Yes, and tell him not to mind a person who is not worth minding, but to go on and put up the tablet. Tell him that everybody approves of it, and expects it."

Mrs. Langbrith emerged from her absence, but the stare which she bent upon the girl was as silent as her far-off look.

"Will it do for me to ask the doctor? I don't want to do it,

because— But I will, rather than let it go as it is. I will do anything. What do you think, Mrs. Langbrith?"

Mrs. Langbrith shook her head, and said, with something that she kept from being a shudder, "Oh, no, it won't do to speak to Dr. Anther."

"For me? Or for any one?"

"For you. I—I will speak to him!"

"You? Oh, thank you, Mrs. Langbrith! I thought—I hoped—I didn't dare to hope—" The pent emotions, kept in so bravely, broke in tears, and Hope caught her handkerchief from her belt and sobbed into it. "Oh, dear, I don't see why you do it! I don't see how you can bear to look at me, or speak to me, much less do anything I ask you to, after the mischief I've made. But I do, *do* thank you—"

She wavered toward the other, with what design she did not know; but, whatever it was, Mrs. Langbrith put her arms round her, and pulled her head down on her shoulder, and the girl had her cry out there. "Oh, I'm so ashamed, I'm so ashamed!" she kept saying. "I don't know why you let me, Mrs. Langbrith!"

Mrs. Langbrith did not say, and perhaps could not; but when Hope's passion of weeping was spent, and she drew away to wipe her eyes, and compose her face, the woman said, irrelevantly, "How is your father, Hope?"

"Oh, much better. I believe the doctor thinks he can cure him?"

"That's good," Mrs. Langbrith said as irrelevantly as before, and now she let the girl, with a fling of her arms round her neck, run out of the house unhindered.

Half-way to the gate she met Mrs. Enderby coming up to make a call on Mrs. Langbrith; and, from behind the veil she had caught down over her face, she was able to chaunt a gay little "Good afternoon, Mrs. Enderby!" without exciting any question in the lady, except as to how a girl whose life was so tragically conditioned could keep that blithe note in her voice.

XIX.

Almost the first thing Mrs. Enderby said was, "That poor, pretty creature, how wonderfully she keeps up!" for this was what was still first in her mind when she took the place at the window which Hope had just left, and looked to see if she could still see her.

Mrs. Langbrith said, "Won't you have a fan?" and Mrs. Enderby thanked her and took from her the fan which Hope had dropped on the table. "It is unseasonably warm."

"We often have a hot day like this toward the beginning of May."

"Oh, yes, that is true. But the leaves not being out makes it so melting in the sun. Is there the least hope for the child's father?"

"Dr. Anther has always believed his habit could be cured."

"Oh, yes, Dr. Anther: how we all depend upon him! Saxmills would be another place without him. We turn to him in so many things. I was just thinking about him—just speaking about him with Dr. Enderby. But, Mrs. Langbrith, what is this I hear about your son's giving up the notion of the tablet to his father? I hope it isn't true—just town gossip."

"James hasn't said anything to me about giving it up," Mrs. Langbrith answered, and she quelled the outward signs of her wonder whether Hope had come to her with a half confession, and had been twice as silly and light-tongued as she had owned. "He has given up having the dedication on Decoration Day."

"Oh, well, perhaps that's it, and it has got twisted into the other thing. May I say that you have heard nothing from him in regard to it?"

Mrs. Langbrith could truthfully assent to this, but she assented with so much coldness that Mrs. Enderby was struck by it, and a little hurt. In her kind heart, which was equal to most emergencies where excuses were needed for offences, she accounted for the coldness as the expression of rustic shyness. She had known village modesty to take the form of village pride, and, later, unmask itself in touching gratitude.

"We all," she went on, after thanking Mrs. Langbrith for her assent, "think it such an admirable idea, and Dr. Enderby particularly favors it. He feels it so important to recognize *character*, especially when it has influenced a whole community as Mr. Langbrith's has influenced Saxmills, and stamped his traits on the place, as Dr. Enderby says, that I believe he would have been glad to have a tablet to Mr. Langbrith's memory in the church."

At this point Mrs. Enderby certainly expected some sort of response; but Mrs. Langbrith preserved a silence of unbroken iciness. Perhaps she did not like the notion of a tablet in the church. Mrs. Enderby went on:

"But, of course, he feels that there is a peculiar fitness in its being in the library building. We all do, and I am sure every one will be glad to hear that there is nothing in that report, or nothing but a perversion of the Decoration Day part of it."

Mrs. Langbrith made no sign of gratification in Mrs. Enderby's conclusion, and Mrs. Enderby had to go away in an uncomfortable misgiving for the effect of the interest she had shown in the matter. She had no misgiving for the interest itself. That was simply a duty toward one of her husband's parishioners, such as she had promised herself to fulfil toward all after she had so reluctantly consented to his taking the parish of St. Cuthbert's at Saxmills. She felt that she was not only following him into the wilderness—anywhere over twenty miles from Boston was the wilderness for a Bostonian of her elect origin—but she had fears of the peculiar difficulties which a priest of Dr. Enderby's socialistic—she called

them "sociological"—tendencies would have in a cure of proletariat souls, housed in a temple built with money from their exploitation. Langbrith had given St. Cuthbert's small but sufficient church to the parish, as well as the library to the town; and Mrs. Enderby's question was, whether her husband could keep that perfect conscience between a due sense of gratitude toward the giver's memory, and his duty toward the employees of his son's milling property, in the event of those differences which might any time arise between capital and labor. She had been awakened by this question one memorable night, and had not been able to wait till morning before submitting it to Dr. Enderby, in a conscience inherited from Calvinistic forefathers through a Unitarian father who had preserved nothing from his ancestral faith but the conscience transmitted to his family of daughters. Dr. Enderby's own conscience was of the same lineage, and it cost them both a night's sleep to decide the point. In fact, it was not until late into the next afternoon that they had reasoned to the conclusion that to do right was his sole duty, and that to shrink from conditions which might sometimes render the right embarrassing or difficult would be a confession of unworthiness for the office they both wished to magnify.

Mrs. Enderby came away from Boston with all the reluctance that she had foreseen, but with none of the regret; and, though she was followed by the sympathies of her friends, she had as yet experienced nothing which turned her mind toward them in longing for their pity. Saxmills had not proved quite the social desert, beset with dangers, which she had sometimes foreboded. She had there, as everywhere, her husband, first and foremost; and, besides, there were several people she liked. Not counting those she loved because they were poor and sick and dependent, there were, among those she liked, Judge Garley and his wife, who were agreeable mid-Massachusetts town-folk, reasonably cultivated and passably acquainted with life, by reason of several winters' official residence in Boston; and she liked Mrs. Langbrith, ordinarily, very much, though she was not quite what Mrs. Enderby would have quite called cultivated, and certainly not acquainted with life. But her shy charm was a great charm for Mrs. Enderby, and it was much in her favor that she always made Mrs. Enderby think of that old-fashioned, late-summer flower, mourning-bride. The abiding girlishness of the long-widowed, middle-ageing woman responded to a girlishness of her own, from which she was fond of all the nice young girls of the village, like Hope Hawberk and Susie Johns and Jessamy Colebridge, and such others as did not dismay her by their fearlessness with the young men. Outside of the mills, the young men were, indeed, so few that there was, perhaps, not much reason to be afraid of them. But, above all, she liked and respected and honored Dr. Anther, whose life had such a daily beauty that she could better have expressed her sense of it if she were still a Unitarian, than she could now she was a churchwoman. She was

constantly finding him in the houses of affliction, which she visited in her own quality of good angel, and it was without surprise or any feeling of coincidence that she now met him coming to the gate of a common patient, which she opened next after closing Mrs. Langbrith's.

She merely said, "Oh, how delightful, Dr. Anther! I was just thinking of you." And then she added, "I hope you leave our poor sufferer better?"

"*You* will, after you have seen her," the doctor said, shifting his little bag of medicines from his right to his left hand, so as to take the hand Mrs. Enderby put out to him. He had a fine perception of her lady-world in Mrs. Enderby, and liked to say as nice things as he could to her. "She needs cheering up, and you'll be better for her than my medicine."

"If I could believe you were serious in your civilities, I should be conceited; but I know you only say such things to cheer *me* up—not that I need it just now. I've been to see Mrs. Langbrith, and she has reassured me in regard to a strange report I had heard. I wonder if you had."

"Better try me," Anther said, twitching his bag up and down with a latent impatience.

"Why, merely that her son had given up the notion of the memorial tablet for the library front. Had you?"

"No," Anther replied shortly, jerking his bag with open violence.

"Well, if you do, there's nothing in it, as far as his mother has heard. He *has* changed his mind about having the dedication on Decoration Day, and the report probably arose from that." The doctor said nothing, and once more Mrs. Enderby was bruised and disappointed by the bluntness of village manners—this time from one who had always been so responsive. But she rose above it, as she would have said, so far as to excuse him in consoling herself. "But I see your mind is on your next patient, doctor. It's cruel of me to keep you, and I won't any longer. Good-by!"

She went in to cheer up the sick woman, but even after the exhilarating effort she came away with a little lingering impression of Dr. Anther's indifference to her news. She submitted her impression to her husband, whom she found struggling with a sermon of an hour's length rebellious to his ideal of twenty-five minutes. He detached himself to examine the impression, and to match it with one he had brought away from the supper at Mrs. Langbrith's, when Dr. Anther had received young Langbrith's proposal of the tablet with so little interest. "Perhaps," he suggested, "it is not that country uncouthness altogether: there may not have been all that friendliness between the doctor and the elder Langbrith which we have inferred from his present relations to the family."

"Why, have you heard anything of that kind?" Mrs. Enderby was of an eagerness in her inquiry which her husband thought it well to repress.

"No, nothing at all. It's pure conjecture with me."

"It would be very interesting." Mrs. Enderby sighed for the evident want of foundation in fact.

"Yes, but, Alice, don't let it take possession of your fancy. It would be very unjust and it might be injurious."

"Oh, I should not dream of mentioning it to any one. To whom could I? But it happens to tally—is that slang?"

"I don't know that it is."

"I oughtn't to use it if it is, in a place like this. It happens to tally with something that has come into my mind. I have always wondered why Dr. Anther doesn't marry Mrs. Langbrith."

"He may not wish it, or she may not."

"It would be such an appropriate thing. They are old friends, and they are not too old. Her son will soon be leaving her—I know he's in love with that poor, pretty, joyous Hope Hawberk; and the doctor must have always been very uncomfortable at Mrs. Burwell's, and now she's going to break up, and where *will* he go?"

"He certainly might do worse than go to Mrs. Langbrith's," the rector allowed; "but still there is no more proof that he wishes to marry Langbrith's widow than that he bears a grudge to his memory."

"No, but don't you see that, if he *did* want to marry Mrs. Langbrith, it would make him willing to have Mr. Langbrith forgotten? Wouldn't that be natural?"

"I'm afraid it would, Alice," the rector said with a regretful recognition of a trait of fallen man.

"And wouldn't it account both for the way Dr. Anther behaved that night, and for the way he behaved just now?"

"It might; but don't you see we are proceeding upon a pure hypothesis?"

"That is true," she consented; and now, having not before removed her hat, she pulled out the long pins that pierced its sides into the mass of her handsome graying hair, and lifted it off, carried it out of the study on her hand, thoughtfully considering it as she went.

"Of course, Alice," he called after her, "we must both be careful to keep our hypothesis to ourselves."

"Oh, yes indeed! I shall be very careful not to speak of it."

XX.

After indulging his resentment of Hope's ridicule, to the violent extreme of renouncing all intention of the memorial tablet, Langbrith allowed a natural revulsion of feeling to carry him so far back as a renunciation of Hope instead. He wrote her an angry letter, in answer to hers asking him not to mind anything she had said for the reason that she was not worth minding herself. Then he felt so much stronger that he returned to his intention, and got

Falk to go with him into Boston to the studio of the young sculptor who was modelling the bas-relief. It had to be done from few and rather poor photographs, for it had not been one of his father's excesses to sit often for his picture. There were some ferrotypes and still older daguerreotypes from which the sculptor had imagined a head more or less ideal. Falk tacitly considered the ideal an improvement on the portrait in the library at Saxmills, and he had kept Langbrith from sending for the painting by sufficiently offensive censures of its woodenness. Besides, as that was from a photograph too, he held that there would be no advantage in studying the tablet from it.

The young sculptor was a find of Langbrith's in the course of his own æsthetic development. He had seen some idealistic banalities of the artist in an art-dealer's window, and had liked them so much that he had got Falk to come and look at them too, and then join him in looking up the sculptor, who, when looked up, proved to be a beautiful, poverty-stricken young Jew, with black hair bushing out over a fine forehead, and, under the forehead, mobile, attentive eyes. He had a profile more Hellenic than Hebraic, and cheeks and chin already blue from shaving a dense beard. It appeared that he had made the banalities to sell, and that he could do stronger if not truer things, as the casts in his studio witnessed. He entered into the motive of the medallion, as Langbrith presented it, with an ardor that matched Langbrith's, and he roughed it out in the clay so quickly that in twenty-four hours he had something to show his patron. He had conceived so aptly of his patron, if not of his subject, that he had flattered the effigy of the elder Langbrith into a likeness of the son, who stood before it in content little short of ecstasy.

"Falk," he said, "it has the ancestral look—the look of race. I can see myself in it. That must have been the way my father looked. Wonderful!"

"It is like you," Falk said, with a glance at the sculptor, who was watching Langbrith with subtle and shifty eyes. "I always supposed you rather resembled your mother."

"Not at all," Langbrith retorted. "There may be something in our features, but her expression is totally different. I see nothing of my mother in this."

"Well, if you're satisfied, that's the end of the story."

"But look, Falk, look at these old pictures!" At the first question, the sculptor had supplied them, and Langbrith now held them in his hand, studying them and then the sketch. "You can see that the outline is the same, and Mr. Lily has read the character into the face which these caricatures belie. It's the artistic resurrection from the mechanical death of these tin-types. It's miraculous!"

"Well, Mr. Lily probably believes in miracles."

The sculptor presented an impervious surface to the smile of

Falk's irony, and Langbrith continued to effervesce without heeding his friend.

"And you've taken my notion most delightfully about the inscription, Mr. Lily. It's just the effect I wanted, fronting the eyes there in those lines of compact capitals, and balanced by that low relief of the mills at the back of the head. Of course, I know that there's nothing definite in those details yet; but the face is so perfect, so struck, as if with a die, that I dread to have you touch it. Do you think you can keep just that look in working it up?"

The young sculptor pouted his handsome, thick, red lips, and said, "I think so," stealing a glance from his subject to his patron.

"Well," Langbrith sighed, "I shall have to trust you," and Falk laughed out. "What's the matter?" Langbrith demanded.

"Of course, you'll have to trust him! You're not running this work of art."

"Oh, I didn't understand you. Of course! And how soon can you have it done, Mr. Lily?"

"How long can you give me?" the sculptor asked.

"I did think of Decoration Day for the dedication, but I've changed my mind about that. I think now I will have it on my father's birthday—the 29th of June. Could you have it ready by that time?"

The sculptor seemed considering seriously, and at last he said, reluctantly, as certain people do to enhance the value of a concession, "I think I can, if there's no delay in the foundry. If there is, you know you can dedicate a gilded plaster copy and put up the bronze later—any time."

"Ah, I don't believe I should like that. It wouldn't be in character with my father. He always paid cash. I shall trust you to have it ready in time. I know you can have it done."

Langbrith remained studying the sketch until Falk's restiveness obliged him to break from it. The more he saw himself in his portrait of his father, the better he was pleased, and the truer he decided the likeness to be. The family look certainly was there, and what greater truth could he ask? With all the self-satisfaction of the academic side of his nature, he rejoiced in what he decided to be an ideal presentation of his father's face.

The sculptor followed him and Falk to the door of his studio, and bowed them out.

"Little Sheeny!" Falk observed when the door had closed upon them.

"He says he is an Italian, but he's all the finer artist for his drop of the 'indelible blood,'" Langbrith said, still rejoicing.

"Every drop of blood in his body is indelible. He ought to be a puller-in. He could sell *you* any misfit in the store. I'll do a puller-in at a Roman statuary's for *Caricature*, and I'll have this fellow working off a Mercury on you, come up from your Sabine papyrus-mill."

"If you didn't like it, Falk—"

"Why not say so? What good would that have done, with your infatuation? Besides, I didn't say I didn't like it. There's a lot of infernal *chic* about it. In its way it's damnably good, but it's you, you poor innocent, right over again, and that's what he was aiming at from the first moment he got those eyes of his afloat on you."

"If that's the way you feel—" Langbrith began, half turning.

Falk caught him by the coat lapel and pulled him round again. "What are you going to do? Countermand it? You couldn't get a better job, and the poor devil needs the job. Don't I tell you it's good? It's all the better for having so much of you in it, if I do say it that hate to. Come! you've blundered and he's swindled into the very thing. Let him go on!"

Langbrith moved reluctantly forward. "If I could trust you, Falk—"

"You've got to."

"I never can make you understand how I feel about my father. He's a religion with me, and anything that seems to belittle him or belie him is a profanation. If I didn't feel that somehow the fellow *had* got my father into the thing, I wouldn't let him go on. Of course, I can see that he has had to work back from me—get the life into it from me! But, apart from the question of the likeness, don't you think it's good?"

"Haven't I said so? The fellow has done it mighty well."

"He has taken all my suggestions," Langbrith said, reaching out for a little more kindness.

"Yes, and St.-Gaudensized them. That's all right. That was the thing to do. At this time of day, he couldn't get away from St.-Gaudens."

"I'm anxious to have him go on," Langbrith dreamily continued, "because he can get it done in time, and I don't know who else could." He hesitated, as he must, even in the intimacy of his confidence with Falk, before adding, "I've just told Hope that I'm having him do it. I've told her that I had taken it up again."

"Why, had you dropped it?"

"Yes," Langbrith owned uneasily. "We had a little misunderstanding about having the dedication on Decoration Day. Falk, I want to tell you; but you're so sharp—"

"Oh, go on, I'll spare you on condition that you're honest."

"Well, you know she didn't approve of that idea, and she put it in such a light about its not being fair to take the day from the old soldiers whom it belonged to, that I saw it just as she did, and I telegraphed her—"

"Telegraphed!" Falk opened his mouth for a laugh, but shut it again without laughing.

"Oh, laugh! I don't care now! And she came back at me with a letter that cut me to the quick. She's terribly sarcastic, or can be. She made all sorts of fun of me for thinking my agreement with her opinion so important that it could not wait for a letter."

Of course, she put it in the way of mocking at herself, saying that she never supposed before that she was of so much consequence that her opinions had to be accepted by telegraph. It ground me awfully, and I took it like a perfect ass."

"Naturally!" Falk interjected.

"Oh, don't mind *me*!" Langbrith exulted. "I wish I could always be an ass to such purpose. I wrote back to her that she needn't be anxious hereafter, for I had given up the whole scheme of the tablet, and I should never trouble her again by my method of asking or acknowledging her opinions."

"That sounds so wise that it must be true," said Falk. "Go on. I thought I knew you, my young friend, but you are unfathomable."

"I begin to believe it. And that brought a letter from her, protesting against my giving up—very dignified and impersonal, and all that; but I was still so sore that I let her letter go unanswered a couple of days, and then there came another from her, entreating me to go on with my plan, and saying if I didn't she never could forgive herself; that she had not meant anything by what she said of my telegraphing; that it was only fun, and I oughtn't to take it in earnest; but if I must, she withdrew it all. She said she knew that if it got about that I was going to give up the plan, it would make all sorts of talk and be very disagreeable."

"She had probably told about your telegraphing to some of the other girls," Falk interpreted. "Susie Johns, likely. Or even Jessamy Colebridge."

"That was what I thought at first, and it made me madder still."

"Yes, you are that kind of ass," Falk assented.

"So I decided not to answer that second letter. And then came one that was fairly imploring. It was dated a day later, and she said in it that she was so miserable she had to write again, and she should not till she heard I was going on with my plan."

"You must have felt proud."

"No, I didn't. I felt ashamed."

"I'm surprised."

"Oh, I deserve anything you can say. She kept up the effect of joking, but she must have been serious, or she wouldn't have written three times."

"And having brought the suppliant to her knees, what did the Prince of Saxmills graciously deign to answer?"

"The P. of S. had already answered the second letter, on second thoughts. He had written to tell her not to think of the matter again; for, on looking it all over, he found that he couldn't relinquish the plan now. He tried to make his decision seem unrelated to her, because he didn't think it fair to take the advantage she had given him."

"I'm glad to hear it," Falk said. "It's a little fact that enables me to continue your acquaintance, which I was just going to drop. Langbrith, don't you know that that girl is one of the most—"

"I think I don't need any one to tell me what she is," Langbrith interrupted, haughtily. Then he instantly stooped from his height. "But I appreciate your feeling, Falk, and I thank you. I was glad that I had answered her second letter, and that my answer and her third had crossed, because I got a letter from my mother with the third from Hope, saying Hope had been to see her, and had told her the trouble she was in. I shouldn't have liked her to think I had done for my mother, even, what I wouldn't do for her."

"Yes, you saved your distance. I congratulate you."

"That's mighty kind of you," said Langbrith, fondly. "And you think—you think, don't you, that the whole situation looks rather favorable for me?"

"Oh, come now! I can't go into that, Langbrith. It's more than I bargained for."

Langbrith went on dreamily: "She must have been a good deal troubled. She asked my mother how it would do to get Dr. Anther to write to me, and my mother had to put her off, by promising to ask him herself. Afterwards she decided not to ask, but to write to me instead. I rather wish she *had* asked the doctor," he concluded, meditatively.

"Why?"

"Oh, there is something that has rankled in me ever since the night of our supper-dance: the way Anther took my proposal of the tablet. Didn't you notice anything peculiar in his manner?"

"He didn't seem to take a great deal of interest," Falk owned.

"He is the oldest living friend of my father. I didn't like it. I had it out with my mother, the next morning, and perhaps that made her reluctant to ask him to take any part in it. She is very proud where there is any question of slight to me, and I suppose she felt as I did about my father. Perhaps she found she couldn't do what she promised Hope. But that's a small matter. The great thing is that I hadn't waited for her letter before writing to Hope. I can't be too glad of that. I should have hated even to seem to have done for another what I hadn't done for her. I'm hard hit, and you know it, Falk, and now you've got to listen. That girl is the rarest human creature on this earth."

"Why not say in the universe, and be done with it?"

"Because I don't want to wrong her by any sort of extravagance. She's so perfect, she has such poise, such spiritual proportion—through her sense of humor, I suppose—that any sort of excess seems an insult to her. She's wonderful, I see that more and more. Sometimes, when I think of her hard life with that opium-eating father of hers, and that belated old Puritan of a grandmother, and how her days must pass between the horrors of his narcotic and her religious frenzies, I wonder she can keep her sanity. But she is the sanest and sweetest and wholesomest and loveliest soul alive. She doesn't seem any more related to her surroundings or origin than the singing that you hear come out of a church window

in summer, and that you can't connect with the stifling and perspiring congregation inside. It's disembodied worship, and she's just joyous girlhood incarnate."

"Oh, Lord! I can't stand much more of this!" Falk groaned.

"When I think of her," Langbrith went on, careless of his sufferings, "I seem to myself the most contemptible and unworthy caricature of humanity—full of every kind of ridiculous imperfection and detestable defect; a wrong-headed, stubborn mule, with an instinct for kicking at the wrong time and in the wrong place, with a hide so thick and a fibre so coarse that any suggestion for its own good, short of a big stick, is lost on it."

"Well, now," Falk got in his revenge, "you can understand just how you seem to other people a good deal of the time when you're *not* thinking of her."

XXI.

"What's this I hear?" Hope's grandmother required of the gayety which, even beyond the girl's cheerful wont, marked her rebound from her trouble after Langbrith's second letter came. "Folks are sayin' that James is not goin' to put that inscription of his father on the library, and then again that he is. You know anything about it, Hope?"

"Yes, I know all about it, grandma. They're right both ways. He wasn't and he is, unless he's changed his mind again."

"How do you know?"

"He's written to tell me."

The old woman's eyes flared on the smile in the girl's. "What's James Langbrith writin' to you so much for?"

"He seems to like to."

"You engaged to him?"

"Not at present, grandma."

"Better see't you ain't. I don't like the breed any too well. I hain't ever been satisfied at the way he got your father out of the business, and your mother wa'n't at the time. But she's in her grave now, and your father can't ever be got to say a sensible word about it; just praises him up, if you try to talk with him, when everybody knows that Royal Langbrith never drew an unselfish breath. He never went to church and he never darkened anybody's doors in the place, and why he gave that library to the town nobody will ever know. It wa'n't like him to give anything; and I guess if your father could be got to tell the truth once, folks would sing a different song. I don't like your close-mouthed kind, that force one out of partnership and never say why nor wherefore."

A yell from the chamber in the half-story over the room where the two women sat at breakfast, offered itself in apt explanation. Groans and sighs followed, and gasps of prayer and thanksgiving, and then muffled fumbings and stumbings on the floor, as of a man getting out of bed and dressing.

"My! how it does always go through me," the old woman

quavered. "I don't see how you can take it so, Hope. I can't seem to get used to it!"

"I was born used to it," the girl answered, with a patience that was cheerful, even smiling. "He hasn't had such a dream for a good while. He must have been at the laudanum bottle, instead of the other. I'll just look." She ran quickly up the crooking stairs, and her voice made itself heard in fond reproach. "Now, father, how *could* you? What's the use of my trying to trust you? And don't you see what it does? Just throws away all the good effects, and brings us back where we were before."

"Yes," she reported triumphantly to her grandmother, as she reappeared with a large empty bottle in her hand. "It's just as I supposed, and I've got to go and tell Dr. Anther as soon as I've taken father some coffee. Will you put it on the stove, Grandma, while I help him dress? I must hurry."

When she found Anther at his office, after his somewhat later breakfast, and told him of her father's case, he once more made the reflection which his experience had often suggested. He had so rarely found the sorrow or shame of one generation carrying over from one generation to another, that he had been shaken in some of the most significant implications of heredity. He had been led to revise his acceptances of the whole doctrine, so far as to hold them in a kind of suspense for further evidence. He now saw the child of one of the most miserable of men so wholly uncontaminate from his wretchedness, so blithe of face, and apparently so light of heart, that he could not refuse to smile when she reported the fact in its humorous aspect, with an unbroken trust in the fortunate result.

"I guess we've got to begin again, Dr. Anther," she said, uncovering the empty bottle. "You see what father's been doing!"

"How came you to notice?" he asked.

"Oh, a dream that almost raised the roof," she laughed. "I should have thought it was the skeleton man and the green dwarf both, but I didn't ask. When I found this, it wasn't necessary." She offered him the bottle, which he received with a face losing its sympathetic cheerfulness. Her eager nerves took alarm at his gravity. "You don't think he's worse?"

"Oh, no," the doctor came back to his professional reassurance; "it's a little disappointment when we had got him so far along, that's all. But it's not a thing to discourage us. We shall have to begin over again, as you say." He set the bottle aside. "I'll bring it to him, and have a talk with him."

"Oh, do!" the girl said, back in her gayety again. "Your talks do him more good than the medicine, I believe. I wanted to have a talk with you myself the other day."

"*You* haven't taken to laudanum, I hope," the doctor said, returning to his smile.

"Well, it was something that gave me bad dreams while it lasted.

I thought I had made mischief, and made it out of pure silliness." The doctor's smile took on the incredulity that prompted her to go on. "Yes, I did, I made mischief—set the gossip going. You know you have heard it, Dr. Anther; about James Langbrith giving up putting the tablet to his father, and then deciding to do it?" The doctor reluctantly assented. "Well, I did that." She possessed him, laughing and blushing, of the whole case, and then waited confidently for her acquittal, or, rather, went confidently on without it as something that might be taken for granted. "Before James decided to do it, finally, I was so worked up that I went to Mrs. Langbrith, and coaxed her to ask you to write to him and tell him to go on. She promised, but concluded to write to him herself. By that time, he had made up his mind to go on anyway. You see what a narrow escape you had. I thought I ought to tell you."

The doctor said, "Yes, that's right," and then a vagueness came into his gaze that made the girl laugh.

"Well, I'm going now," she said.

"Oh, I didn't mean that."

"Well, I'm going before you *do*."

"Hope, you're a good girl," Anther said. "I mustn't praise you to your face; but if any one ever wonders to you that you can keep up as you do, you tell them I say they don't know anything about it; that there isn't one in ten thousand that could bear as you do what you have to bear; but don't ever get to supposing that it's your duty to be sad about it. It's your duty to be gay."

"Well, that's what I like being, you know, Dr. Anther. It's so easy that it doesn't seem like very much of a *duty*."

She had risen, and she stood prettily smiling at him; and he looked at her, and then suddenly turned his back on her, as if shunning a temptation. He longed to take her in his arms. "Well, I'll be up in the course of the forenoon."

Before he went to see Hawberk, he dropped his buggy anchor before the Langbrith mills, and found his way through the works, where the odor of wash-day from the pulp-vats was only denser than it was outdoors, to the office partitioned off in a corner of the building. He pushed open the door, which closed with a weighted cord, and shut himself inside with John Langbrith.

The manager was sitting at his desk, and at the opening and closing of the door, which, through the shuddering and muttering of the machinery, made itself seen rather than heard, he got lankly up and took the doctor's offered hand, which he pushed horizontally back and forth without looking at him. "Good morning, doctor," he said, and then he glanced at the papers on his desk with a desperate sigh.

"John Langbrith," Anther began at once, "you know about this scheme of James's for putting up a tablet to his father?"

"I've heard about it. I heard he had dropped it."

"He's going on with it."

"Well, what have I got to do with it? I've got enough on my hands looking after my job here in the mills."

"Has he consulted you about it?"

"No."

"Well, I advise you to write to him and urge him to stop it."

John Langbrith lifted his narrow yellow eyes and met the doctor's. "Why?"

"You know what your brother really was."

"So do you. Why don't *you* tell James to stop it?"

"That's nonsense. Sometime the truth must come out."

"You mean that you will give it away?"

"That's stuff! But there are others."

"Hawberk? What's *his* word worth?"

"Nothing, now. But if he pulls up—"

"He'll never pull up."

"I have hopes of curing him, and I tell you that, when the truth comes out, there will be shame and sorrow for that boy, and scandal for the community. It isn't for me to tell him about his father, and you know his mother can't. It's for you, or for Hawberk."

"He's making up to Hawberk's girl, ain't he? Then they can fix it with Hawberk. My job is to look after the mills. I'm not going outside of it."

"It would be an outrage to let that girl marry the son of the man who ruined her father, and you will be a partaker in the wrong unless you speak. Tell James about it, and let him act from his instincts of honor and justice."

"I can't go outside of my job."

"If he's allowed to go on and marry that poor girl, it will be taking a cruel advantage of her. She will be marrying him blindfold. She will be trapped and fettered and manacled for life."

"I can't go outside of my job."

"When the truth is known, and it must be known, the effect with the public will be hardening and depraving beyond that of any bad life openly lived. It will breed a spirit of defiant cynicism, and put a premium on hypocrisy. It will be inconceivably debauching and corrupting. Think it over, Langbrith!"

"I sha'n't go outside of my job."

The words came with an unexcited dryness which convinced Anther of their finality, and kept him from saying more. But Langbrith followed him to the door with words more forbidding still.

"I don't owe that young man anything; let him make a fool of himself any shape he wants to. And I don't owe this community anything; it may rot for all me. And I don't owe *you* anything; you mind your own business! I don't want you bothering round here any more."

Anther made him no answer. He did not blame him greatly. He knew John Langbrith to be as clean a man as his brother had been foul; but he knew that it was not in the measure of his narrow

nature to do what he had required of him. His job was the measure of him, and Anther owned to himself that John Langbrith could be safe only in keeping to that.

He was lifting his hitching-weight into the buggy, when he felt a hand on his shoulder, and recognized in its touch the heavy mental method of Judge Garley, "Been asking brother John for help?" the judge conjectured.

With the weight dangling by its strap, Anther said, "Yes, I have."

"Well, you didn't get it, I presume. Brother John likes the safe side, which happens in this case to be the inside. I have been considering the matter you laid before me the other day, and my advice is to drop it."

"I sha'n't drop it!" Anther answered, sharply.

The judge did not mind his wilfulness. "At this late day, nothing can be done—nothing but mischief can be done—by drawing the frailties of our departed brother from their dread abode."

"That's what you said."

"Well, that merely proves that I saw it in the right light at first, before taking time to reflect upon it. It increases my respect for myself without diminishing my regard for you, my dear friend. You can accomplish nothing whatever by the course you propose to pursue. An exposure would come from you with a peculiarly bad grace; it is hardly necessary for me to say why; and it would only convince the young man that you were his father's enemy. You could not count upon his mother's corroboration in such an event."

"I could count upon her truth, in any event."

The judge slowly shook his large head. "Not if she is the good woman I take her to be." Anther nervelessly dropped the hitching-weight, and it fell so near the judge's foot that he looked down at it, though he did not move. "My dear friend, you would stand unaided and alone, and the outraged sentiment of the community would be against you. The sentimentality of the community would overwhelm you. Your exposure of the boy's father would be attributed to the worst motive, in the absence of any, and the tide of pity for him would bear you down."

"Look here, Judge Garley!" Anther said. "Would you deliver the dedication address, if you were asked, knowing what you do?"

"There will be time to consider that point when I have been asked. I may say in general terms that I would refuse to do nothing that I was required by my sense of public duty to do."

"It's a pity you went out of politics," Anther said, dryly. He got a new grip of his anchor-strap, and lifted the weight into his buggy. Then he lifted himself in.

But the judge laid a detaining hand on the frame of the lowered top, and questioned with an anxious smile: "Anther, I hope you are not about to do anything precipitate?"

Anther braced himself for an angry reply, and then fell back

against the seat. "Oh, precipitate! I don't know that I'm going to do anything at all."

"Well, that's right," the judge said, and let him drive away.

XXII.

The twenty-ninth of June was fixed for the dedication of the tablet, and the time that passed before that date seemed by no means too long for the work of preparation. The young sculptor, under the inspiration of Langbrith's frequent visits, worked with such ardor that he finished the bas-relief early enough to send the model to Chicopee, and have it cast in the bronze which alone satisfied Langbrith's sense of the sincerity essential in the tribute he was paying to his father's memory; and Falk owned that the sculptor had done his work well. He had done it with a touch that suggested the most modern sculpture, and yet preserved a sort of allegiance to the stern Puritan nature of the subject. Royal Langbrith was there not only in the life, but in what his son felt to be that high personal character proper to him. Here was a man, not of the immediate moment, but of that hour of the later eighteen sixties which created the immediate moment: the hour of the Republic's supreme consciousness, when all the American forces, redeemed from their employment in the waste of war, were given to enterprises which have since enriched us, and, under the direction of such captains of industry as Langbrith's father, have pressed forward to the commercial conquest of the world. The face, which the sculptor had imagined from the son's face more than from the likenesses supplied him, wore not the old-fashioned Websterian frown of the ante-bellum Americans, when there was no greatness but political greatness in the popular ideal, but had almost an eager smile, full of business promptness, and yet with refined intelligence, a sagacity instantly self-helpful, but ultimately not unkindly. The son's heart glowed within him as he looked at it, and he offered it the ancestor-worship of a man proud of his race, of a dreamer idealizing the future from the past. He wished Hope could see it with him, and the wish reddened him with a conscious blush.

He wrote home to his mother, declaring his entire satisfaction with the work, and predicting her own; and he betrayed his impatience for the event which should appeal with that sculptured face to the gratitude of the community at Saxmills. During his childhood and boyhood, when he had looked out upon the place always as through the windows of his father's house, with a sense of being in it but not of it, he had nourished the arrogant, yet affectionate, longing to dominate it by winning its kindness for himself and his name. His impassioned reveries abounded in dramas of his acceptance by the matter-of-fact little Yankee town, in a sort of seigneurial supremacy, which should be its voluntary acknowledgment of what the Langbriths had done for it; and during the

absences of his college years he had not wholly lost this ambition. His temperament had kept him from great knowledge of the world, and such knowledge as he had grown into had given his boyish fancies practical shape rather than destroyed them. He might be a disagreeable fool, as he often approved himself to his acquaintance, but he was not finally an ignoble fool.

At the bottom of Langbrith's heart still rankled the obscure resentment for Dr. Anther's obscure indifference to his scheme, that he had instantly felt when he first spoke of the scheme before the village magnates in his mother's house. The bruise of that obstruction against which he had so unexpectedly struck remained, and nothing could assuage the hurt but Anther's conviction of wrong and his confession of it. He wondered at times if his mother had ever spoken of the matter to Anther. He had peremptorily forbidden her to do so, in the first letter he wrote home afterwards, but he had hoped she would. Yet no word came from her concerning it, and he could only suppose that she had too faithfully obeyed him. At times, he questioned his own impressions of the fact, and doubted whether it happened, with the significance which his veneration for his father and his affection for Dr. Anther both gave it; and again he could not rid himself of the belief that it had happened in the form and meaning which it first seemed to have.

Before it happened, he had imagined asking Anther, as foremost of the Saxmills men who had known his father, to deliver the dedicatory address; but, with this bruise, this doubt, in his mind, it was impossible to do that; and he felt himself less able to demand the explanation from Anther which he sometimes trembled upon the point of asking, than to turn to some one else for the address. He would have preferred Anther to all others, even if Anther had not been his father's old friend; for the doctor had his repute as a speaker of simple effectiveness; his oration at the celebration of the first Decoration Day after the great war was remembered still in Saxmills, with the exaggerated admiration which history compels when it becomes tradition. It seemed to Langbrith that no one could do such justice to the quiet, almost disdainful, virtues of his father, as the quiet, almost disdainful, powers of his father's friend. But now he had to devolve for the office of orator upon Judge Garley, a speaker of most respectable gifts, but pompous and ponderous, and of a personal ignorance of the man to be commemorated which, in Langbrith's estimation, all but disqualified him. The sweet in the bitter was the hope that Anther might feel the slight of being passed over, and be duly humiliated; but this did not so much console Langbrith as it might if he had not been hurt in his love as well as his pride.

The judge met the doctor driving through the town the day after he had Langbrith's letter requesting him to make the address, and he overcame a certain embarrassment he had in telling his old friend of it.

"I congratulate you," the doctor said with ironical dryness; but he did not ask the judge if he had consented.

"I do not know," the judge said, "whether you will approve of my accepting the invitation."

"Oh, approve!" the doctor said, with deprecation which was also ironical.

But the judge showed no resentment. "I didn't think it was fair to bother you with the matter, or else I should have come to speak with you before writing. But I did not see how I could decline, and I believe you will be satisfied with the manner in which I shall treat the subject."

Anther, if he was too much vexed to try penetrating the reserve which the judge's words invited him to explore, felt also that he had no right to take any tone of censure with him. He said, "You couldn't refuse without wounding the boy's feelings."

"That was what I felt," the judge answered, with relief. "I might have pleaded an excuse of some kind, such as intended absence from the place, but I did not like to do so, in view of the fact that I shall be detained here by some business that is coming up at the time. He asked for an early answer, so that he might get ready some biographical material he wishes to supply me with."

There was a twinkle in the judge's legal eye, and a smile at the corner of his legal mouth, and he responded with a laugh to the doctor's remark: "In addition to what I have given you?"

"Yes, I need all that I can get on account of that!" The judge roared at his own fun, and Anther drove slowly away at the jog-trot which was his horse's habitual gait when they were both absorbed in thought. Their heads hung down with the same droop, and the horse looked as if he might be revolving the same distasteful thought as the doctor, with the same sense of helplessness.

Within the week that followed, Anther was stopped at different times in his progresses through the main street of Saxmills by different leading citizens, who invited him to consult with them upon points of the common interest. James Langbrith seemed not to have rested, after getting Judge Garley's reply, before addressing himself to the Selectmen, the High School Principal, and the Sunday-School Superintendent, as well as the chief officers of the Sons of Pythias and the Saxmills Cadets, inviting their cooperation in the ceremony which he had so much at heart. Each of these dignitaries now addressed himself to Dr. Anther, in his succession, with the confident belief that Dr. Anther, as the oldest friend of Royal Langbrith in the community, and as the close friend of his son and widow, would be most concerned in the affair, and would perhaps have some inside authority and information to impart. He had necessarily to disappoint their hopes, but he found himself putting on more and more the air of at least civic sympathy, which they seemed to demand of him. He could not, indeed, show them his real mind without awakening a suspicion he was far from wishing to rouse,

without starting gossip that would grow into scandal, and involve the Langbriths and himself in mischievous conjecture. He carried his compliance with their obvious expectation to a point where it became almost intolerably irksome, without seeing the point at which he could refuse compliance. When it came to Mrs. Enderby's calling gayly to him from the sidewalk, and halting him, like the rest, to announce that the rector had just had a letter from young Mr. Langbrith asking him to take part in the dedicatory ceremonies, Anther's soul rose in insurrection. "But you knew he had written, I suppose," the lady said.

"No, I certainly didn't," he answered with a sharpness which suggested to her the possibility that the doctor resented the young man's not consulting so old and so near a friend, but suggested it not so forcibly as to withhold her from saying:

"Yes, he has asked Dr. Enderby, and Father Cody, and Mr. Alway of the 'orthodox' church"—she said "orthodox" with the effect of humoring local usage, but also of putting the word between quotation marks—"all to take part. I believe Father Cody is to ask the blessing, and Mr. Alway is to make the opening prayer. Mr. Langbrith has asked my husband to say something from the altruistic standpoint, as it bears upon what his father did for labor in his time by profit-sharing, and, incidentally, if he pleases, to draw any lessons as to character-building from the example of his personality."

Mrs. Enderby ceased obviously reporting Langbrith's diction and continued: "Of course, he is rather vague about what he really does want, but Dr. Enderby found his wish, so far as he imagined it, rather suggestive, and he said at once that he would like to talk with you about it. When could he see you, at your entire leisure?" she could not help pushing officiously on, though she had no authority from her husband to ask the question. Anther did not know what to say, between his ire and his embarrassment. In his hesitation, she added: "I know how difficult it will be for you to fix a time, but I knew how interested you would be!"

"Thank you. I'm afraid I should be very little use," Anther began, but she broke in upon him, to make reparation for James Langbrith's strange thoughtlessness, and to soothe the doctor's wounded pride:

"I'm sure Mr. Langbrith will write you about it. I'm surprised—He probably knows how pressed you are, and wanted to save you all the trouble with details that he could. I rather like his going forward, and doing it all himself, don't you? It shows such spirit, and such a pride in keeping it in his own hands!"

"Yes, yes," Anther said.

"But, of course, you don't have to wait for a direct application from him."

"No."

"Why!" she started in self-surprise. "Why shouldn't you stop in

any evening, and have tea with us, and talk the matter over with Dr. Enderby, then? I should so like to hear you two discussing the civic and social significance of such a man as Royal Langbrith, and getting at the psychology of him. You *will* come, won't you? Won't that be the easiest for you? Will you come, say, to-morrow night?"

"Not to-morrow night. I can't fix the time just now. But I will see. Will you excuse my hurrying off to a patient—"

"Why, of course! How thoughtless of me! But any night will do, doctor, so that it's soon. Good-by, good-by!"

She turned from the gate where she had stopped the doctor, and went indoors to her husband.

"I think it's strangely thoughtless of James Langbrith not to have written to Dr. Anther about the measures he's been taking. The doctor feels it, I know, but he's so large-minded that he'll not let it interfere. He's coming here some evening to talk Royal Langbrith's personality over with you."

"Where have you seen him?"

"At the gate, just now. But I didn't call you, because I didn't want to interrupt you. I've told him all about it, and he's coming the first evening he can. I told him any evening would do. I knew you'd want me to. And all I shall ask is to sit by and hear you two analyze Royal Langbrith. With the scientific standpoint which Doctor Anther can supply, and the philosophic and religious view which you can give, I think it will be one of the most intensely interesting things that ever was. Don't you?"

"I hope you'll find it so, my dear. But, really, young Langbrith's oversight seems an extraordinary—"

"Yes, don't it! I hardly know how to account for it, but if the doctor can overlook it, *we* can, and he's evidently disposed to overlook it. At any rate, I shall 'keep right round after him,' as the country people say, till he redeems his promise."

She so far redeemed her own promise as to halt Anther, whenever she could reach him, by hailing him with her voice, and when she could not, by waving him to a stand with her fluttered handkerchief. But it was not till she had almost lost faith in his large-mindedness, and had many times sided with him and against him in his imaginable resentment of young Langbrith's neglect; it was not till the eve of the day fixed for the dedication ceremonies, that Anther appeared at the rectory. He came too late for tea; and, when he did come, he did not invite Mrs. Enderby's presence at the psychological analysis of Royal Langbrith's personality, which he did not enter upon till she no longer had the least excuse for not leaving him to her husband.

(To be Continued.)